

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

56

VOL. IV. NEW SERIES.

PUBLIC LIBRARY,
DETROIT, MICH.
SEP 17 1888

JANUARY—APRIL,
MDCCCLXV.

Q. 10 LIBRARY
SEP 17 1888

LONDON:
BURNS, LAMBERT, & OATES, 17 PORTMAN STREET,
AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.
RICHARDSON & SONS, DERBY;
SOLD ALSO BY
DUFFY, KELLY, & THE OTHER BOOKSELLERS IN DUBLIN.
1865.

COX AND WYMAN,
ORIENTAL, CLASSICAL, AND GENERAL PRINTERS,
GREAT QUEEN STREET, W.C.

CONTENTS.—No. VII.

ART.	PAGE
<p>I. HOLY SCRIPTURE IN ITS CATHOLIC ASPECTS</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Missal for the Laity. London : Richardson. 1860.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Breviarium Romanum. Mechlin : Hanicq. 1861.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Mysteries of our Holy Faith : Meditations for the Year.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Translated from the Spanish of Da Ponte. 6 vols. London : Richardson. 1854.</p>	1
<p>II. RIO'S SHAKESPEARE</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Shakespeare. Par A. F. Rio. Paris : Douniol. 1864.</p>	21
<p>III. EXTENT OF THE CHURCH'S INFALLIBILITY—THE ENCYCLICAL "MIRARI VOS"</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Gregorii, Divinâ Providentiâ Papæ XVI., Epistola Encyclica ad omnes Patriarchas, Primate, Archiepiscopos, et Episcopos, August 15, 1832.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Œuvres Complètes de F. de Lamennais, revues et mises en ordre par l'auteur. Paris : Cailleux, 1836, 1837.</p>	41
<p>IV. MADAME DE MAINTENON</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Madame de Maintenon et sa Famille. Lettres et Documents inédits. Par Honoré Bonhomme. Paris : Didier. 1863.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Histoire de Madame de Maintenon, et des principaux Événements du Règne de Louis XIV. Par M. le Duc de Noailles, de l'Académie Française. Tomes 4. Paris : Comon. 1849-1858.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">The Life of Madame de Maintenon. Translated from the French. London : Lockyer Davis. 1772.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">The Secret Correspondence of Madame de Maintenon with the Princess des Ursins, from the original manuscripts in the pos- session of the Duke of Choiseul. Translated from the French. 3 vols. London : Whittaker. 1827.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Mémorial de Saint-Cyr. Paris : Fulgence. 1846.</p>	70
<p>V. THE IRISH CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">The Church Establishment in Ireland, Past and Present. Illustrated exclusively by Protestant Authorities ; with Ap- pendices showing the Revenues of the Established Church, the Religious Census of the Population of Ireland, and other returns bearing on this subject. Dublin : Warren. 1863.</p>	107

ART.	PAGE
VI. THE UNIVERSITY QUESTION.....	125
<p>Appendix to a Letter on University Education for English Catholics, suggested by an article in the "Dublin Review." By Very Rev. Canon Oakeley. London : Burns, Lambert, & Oates.</p> <p>Letter addressed to the "Tablet" of Nov. 12, 1864. By the "Catholic Layman."</p> <p>Cui bono? University Education : A Letter to a Catholic Layman by the Rev. H. A. Rawes, M.A., Priest of the Congregation of the Oblates of S. Charles. London : Longman.</p>	
VII. THIERS'S "WATERLOO"	141
<p>Waterloo. Par M. A. Thiers. Paris : L'Heureux. 1862.</p> <p>Waterloo : the Downfall of the First Napoleon. A History of the Campaign of 1815. By George Hooper. London : Smith, Elder, & Co. 1862.</p> <p>Histoire de la Campagne de 1815. Par Edgar Quinet. Paris : Levy. 1862.</p>	
VIII. THE BELGIAN CONSTITUTION AND THE CHURCH	171
<p>Assemblée Générale des Catholiques en Belgique. Première Session à Malines, 18-22 Août, 1863. Bruxelles. 1864.</p>	
IX. CARDINAL WISEMAN'S SERMONS	192
<p>Sermons on our Lord Jesus Christ and on His Blessed Mother. By His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman. Duffy : Dublin and London.</p> <p>Sermons on Moral Subjects. By His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman. Duffy : Dublin and London.</p>	
X. FOREIGN PERIODICAL LITERATURE	214
<p>Dr. Dollinger and the Munich Congress.</p>	
XI. NOTICES OF BOOKS.....	227
<p>Bishop Ullathorne's Letter on the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom—Sermons on the Re-union of Christendom—Mgr. Manning's Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England—Mgr. Dupanloup's Discours sur l'Enseignement Populaire—Vie de Madame Louise Mallac—M. Guizot's Meditations on the Essence of Christianity—Littledale's Unity and the Rescript—H. Ramière's Apostleship of Prayer—Life of S. Anthony of Padua—Purton's Philocalia—Mrs. Meeker's Fortune's Football—De Gaspe's Canadians of Old—F. Rawes's Sursum—Great Truths in Little Words, &c.—Meditations on the Passion, &c.—Canon Oakeley's Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement.—The Month.</p>	
XII. FOREIGN EVENTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.....	251
<p>The Franco-Italian Convention—Germany—Bavaria—Rome.</p>	

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1865.

ART I.—HOLY SCRIPTURE IN ITS CATHOLIC
ASPECTS.

Missal for the Laity. London: Richardson. 1860.

Breviarium Romanum. Mechlin: Hanicq. 1861.

Mysteries of our Holy Faith: Meditations for the Year. Translated from the Spanish of Da Ponte. 6 vols. London: Richardson. 1854.

“MEMBERS of the Romish Church,” says Dr. Colenso, “may say, and have said, that the doctrines and principles of our own Reformers tend, by necessary consequence, to infidelity and atheism.”* And they say so, he argues, with the same amount of justice as certain critics of the present day impute the same tendency to his own opinions. A more unfortunate, a more suicidal, mode of defence could scarcely have been adopted. The bitterest enemies of the Reformation have never damaged and discredited that miserable work with one half of the success with which Dr. Colenso himself has illustrated its total failure in the object which it undertook to compass. It was the Bible as the sole Rule of Faith upon which the Reformation took its stand. What has been the result of this principle in Dr. Colenso’s instance? Here was a missionary bishop, so-called, who, in a spirit of zeal and self-sacrifice worthy of all praise, went out to convert the natives of Africa. At the very beginning of his work, one or two of his disciples bring certain trite and exploded objections against the credibility of the Old Testament. The missionary has not a word to say in defence of his Rule of Faith. He meets the case by palliatives rather than by remedies; takes the objections seriously to heart, broods over them, and allows them to penetrate his mind till they grow and ramify with the virulent fecundity of a cancer. They form a nucleus of scepticism, and soon gather around them other materials like themselves. From harbouring them, and fol-

* “The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined.” Pref.

lowing them up, this pastor of the flock gets by rapid strides to question, and at length to abandon, the veracity and genuineness of the Pentateuch; and in two years he satisfies himself that he is in such absolute possession of "the Truth" (*sic*), that it is his bounden duty, as before God, to propagate his doctrines in a form so cheap and popular as to arrive at the last, least, and lowest of the lay people.

Thus, by a transition which, as far as we know, has no parallel on record for the rapidity of its progress, the completeness of its result, and the insufficiency of its cause, the Apostle of Christianity to the heathen is by the heathen themselves converted into an Apostle of unbelief to the Christians of his own country. The whole foundation of the edifice gives way under the builder's feet, and he confesses himself without the power either of renewing or of replacing it. The Bible is undermined in one of its material parts. The "whole Bible" seems, alas! but too likely to give way under the same process of treatment; and there is "nothing but the Bible" to arrest the progress of the mischief, or to come to the aid of religion with collateral supports. We are altogether too sad about Dr. Colenso's deplorable work, to indulge in any vein of pleasantry concerning it; but we hope it is not inconsistent with the spirit in which we wish to treat so grave a subject, to desire that some artist might describe the contrast between the Catholic and the Protestant Apostle in two pictures, in the one of which should be represented S. Francis Xavier by the side of the Brahmins, using, according to Scripture precedent, the instincts of natural religion and the traditions of an erroneous mythology as a fulcrum for Christian and Catholic teaching; and in the other, Dr. Colenso, at the feet of a Zulu, receiving out of the pages of his own Bible the rudiments of that knowledge by which he was, in the course of time, to disengage from the Holy Scriptures so much of "moral and spiritual truth" as they contain, after their history is transferred to the category of myth; their miracles—God grant that we may be mistaken in this apprehension—condemned to the same fate as their history; their predictions attenuated into figures; and He who was the Archetype of the history, and the Subject of the prophecy, classed, to a very great extent, with "the pious Jews" of His time as respects the amount of His critical acumen and scientific attainments.

Dr. Colenso must be answered, and has been answered, on his own ground; but this is not our purpose in the present article. There are two grand reasons why difficulties such as those which have staggered Dr. Colenso, and which he is so anxious that the people of England should share with him,

can never find a lodgment in the head or heart of any practical and well-instructed Catholic; and these reasons are altogether independent of the special answers which may be given to his objections, whether on grounds peculiar to the Church, or on such as are common to her with other professedly Christian bodies. The first of these reasons is the place which the Scriptures hold, and, *à fortiori*, certain portions of their historical contents, in relation to the entire view of religion in which a Catholic lives, moves, and energises. He enjoys an intellectual and spiritual grasp of the whole Christian dispensation, in virtue of which he feels that merely critical difficulties, however startling, *must* be soluble, even though the particular mode of solution be not at the moment apparent to him. He could no more plead his own personal incapacity to explain such difficulty as an argument against the truth of revelation, than a man afflicted with temporary blindness would feel himself justified in arguing against the presence of daylight. To suppose that one who lives in that intimate realization of Divine Mysteries which is the fruit of habitual meditation, attendance at Mass, observance of holy days, and, above all, frequent reception of the Most Blessed Eucharist, should be perplexed in his faith by the discovery of the fossil of a human jawbone in some ancient stratum, or by not seeing how a camp of the dimensions indicated in the Pentateuch should suffice for the various offices which the Israelites were required to perform in and about it, is like supposing that a man who stands upon the summit of a lofty Alp would puzzle himself about the difficulties of surmounting some jutting crag, which at the foot might be thought to obstruct the upward path, but which, as seen from the top of the mountain, dwindles to the insignificant proportions of a mole-hill. To such a Catholic no canon of criticism can be so fixed, no theory of science so well established, but it must either fall before, or be capable of adjustment with, the certitude of Faith, which to him is incomparably the most powerful of all convictions, the most absorbing of all realities. And the second reason of a Catholic's impassibility to the impressions of ordinary or partial scepticism, is to be found in the light which Divine Faith, God's gift to His Church, diffuses over the page of Holy Scripture itself. This is a subject to which we cannot hope to do justice within the compass of a single article. It will be something, however, if we can but indicate its bearings, and offer one or two of the many illustrations of which it admits.

The Catholic view of God's Written Word, as we need not say, is this—that it is one of the two great repositories of the

Revelation of which His Church is the guardian and dispenser ; and not, as Protestants represent it, a boon dropped from heaven which is at the command and mercy of every stray passenger to take up, explain, and dispose of, according to the light of his understanding and the bent of his disposition. No doubt, purity of intention, and recourse to God in prayer, may enable even those who are outside the Church to arrive at a state of very valuable approximation to the true sense of the Scriptures ; but this is matter of bounty on the part of God, not of law and promise. Outside the Church, even the most accurate perception of the truth of Scripture is but a happy accident, and not a thing to form a basis of calculation, or a subject of confident reliance. On the other hand, there is no error so monstrous, no darkness so intense, as that into which those may fall, and have fallen, who presume to apply to the Scriptures the principle of private interpretation. This circumstance does not, indeed, prove the Catholic doctrine on the subject to be true ; but if that doctrine be true, the delusions and contradictions of which the Bible is the unwilling subject, and the innocent cause, are precisely the results which would follow from contravening or neglecting it. There are, it is needless to say, abundant testimonies to this Catholic belief in the words of our Saviour and the Apostles ; evidences, we mean, that Divine Faith, and not intellectual acuteness, is the appointed clue to the sense of the Holy Scriptures :—"I give thanks to Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them to little ones ;"* with many passages of a like import which will occur to the mind of the pious reader. Our Blessed Lord, indeed, does not merely imply this doctrine, but plainly states it, where He says to His disciples, and through them to the children of His Church in all future ages, "To you it is given to know the mystery of the Kingdom of God ; but to the rest in parables ; that seeing, they may not see, and hearing, may not understand."† Without entering upon the difficult questions which these words involve, it is sufficient to deal with them as enunciating a fact, not less certain in philosophy than consistent with experience, that truths conveyed in the form of an economical dispensation are *φωνᾶντα συνέροις* ; at once preternaturally luminous to those whose spiritual eye is quickened by faith and invigorated by charity, and preternaturally obscure to those who approach them without these requisite qualifications.

* S. Matt. xi. 25.

† S. Luke viii. 10.

A mystery—and what but a mystery is every disclosure to man of the nature and ways of the Most High God?—is either a revelation or a parable (that is, an enigma), accordingly as it strikes, or does not strike, on the eye of Faith. If this be so—and Truth itself is pledged to the statement—there may well be an end of wondering at the hallucinations of those who undertake to interpret the written word of God without reference to its privileged guardians, and at a distance from the light which its Divine Author has made indispensable to the perception of its true meaning. For, however plain and intelligible that word may seem to those who regard its keeping as involving no peculiar privilege, and its interpretation as requiring no divine key, it is certain that while we look at it by the light which the Catholic Church throws upon it by her authorized commentaries, and with her countless illustrations, it comes out as a book so full of hidden meanings and ulterior intentions, as to render its merely superficial sense a blind rather than an index to its real significance. It is no exaggeration to say that the Bible, as read by well instructed Catholics on the one hand, and by most Protestants on the other, is not one but two books.

We have already made full allowance for the light which may be accorded by God's munificent Spirit to those "*homines bonæ voluntatis*" who, even while as yet out of the Church, though on their road to it, study the Holy Scriptures with an honest and religious intention; but we confidently appeal to these, in the fulness of their post-Catholic experience, to bear their witness to the truth of our remark, even in the qualified form in which it applies to them. Nor do we here refer solely, nor yet chiefly, to such illustrations of the Scriptures as have been furnished by the profound intellect and extensive learning of Catholic commentators, excepting so far as the result of their investigation is embodied in treatises or manuals, accessible to Catholics of ordinary intelligence. There is, indeed, one repertory of such illustrations which we must by no means exclude from our list; in fact, we are about to give it great prominence, we mean the Liturgy and Offices of the Church. Yet even these will not suffice to throw the necessary light upon the Scriptures, unless aided by habitual meditation, and by living, as is, of course, the especial privilege of priests, though far from theirs exclusively, in what we may call a Church atmosphere. That, indeed, which almost supplies the place of other aids to such knowledge—whereas none of those aids are independent of it—is habitual meditation; not necessarily, nor always, carried out in its full proportions as a formal religious exercise, but, at least, entering so much into the

general attitude of the mind as to supply the form into which Scripture teaching is habitually and, as it were, instinctively cast.

The light which is thrown upon particular portions of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament by their application to Christian subjects, as brought out in the teaching of the Church, extends even to those historical books which have lately formed the topic of so much flippant and superficial criticism; though, of course, in a far less degree to them than to the more immediately prophetic, didactic, and devotional contents of the inspired volume. Even the use which is made of the Mosaic history in subsequent parts of the Bible (as, for example, in the Psalms, the Book of Wisdom; and again, by our Blessed Lord in the Gospels, and by His Apostles in their Epistles), must be to every devout mind not merely a confirmation of its essential truth, but an evidence of what we may call its secondary and Christian intention. And the Church has surely but caught up the echo of this divinely warranted method of interpretation, where, for instance, she sees in the patriarch Joseph a type of the reputed father of our Divine Lord, or in the fleece of Gideon, moistened by the rain of heaven, and in the burning bush unconsumed, the anticipative illustrations of the ineffable prerogatives and the incorruptible virginity of the Mother of God. The former of these two last-mentioned types may indicate another vast and absolutely unfathomable reservoir of light (if we may use the expression) into which the diligent student of the Scriptures may dive for aid in determining their sense; we mean those parallelisms of phrase or imagery occurring throughout their length and breadth, and manifesting by their mutual illustrations a certain unity of purpose in the mind of the Divine Spirit. How beautifully, in this point of view, does the "*sicut pluvia in vellus descendisti*," in which the Church, referring to the history of Gideon, commemorates the birth of our Divine Saviour in the Office of the Circumcision, harmonize with the "*Rorate, cœli, desuper, et nubes pluant Justum*," with which she has been inviting His descent during Advent!

It is thus that the Church discharges her mission as the Interpreter of Holy Writ. She gives to it unity, consistency, and expression. Till subjected to the power of her master hand, the several portions of the Inspired Scriptures may be compared to the disjointed works of a watch, each beautiful and complete in its separate integrity, the products all of consummate skill, but waiting, as it were, for the last essay of the artificer's wisdom to combine and arrange them with a view to the ultimate end of their formation. Or rather,

we may compare the separate portions of the Scriptures, united as we find them in a single volume, to one of those complicated and ingenious musical instruments which emit a certain melody by means of a self-acting machinery, but which require the touch of a living hand, the agency of a living soul, to impart to them that peculiar power of expression which no mere mechanical contrivances can do more than faintly simulate. Like a true and intelligent interpreter as she is, the Church is not content with merely reporting the words of which she is the medium of transmission to the faithful, but undertakes to convey their *sense*; at times enlarging upon them, and even taking allowable liberties with their order and collocation, with the view of bringing out more explicitly the Faith of which in her hands they are the expositors.*

These ends the Church attains more especially by exercising on the letter of Scripture a marvellous power of concentration. She gathers its scattered rays into a focus, and renders them illustrative of this or the other truth which it is to her purpose to bring out. The season of the year which has already directed us to some former illustrations of our subject, invites us to dwell for a moment, as an exemplification of these remarks, upon the manner in which the Church gives effect to the scattered and multiform revelations of the Holy Scriptures upon the subject of our Lord's Manifestation in the Flesh. Take, for instance, the three Masses on Christmas-day. Each of them has a character especially its own; and the three in their combination exhibit the Birth of our Divine Lord in the very plenitude of its significance. The first, or Midnight-Mass, represents the Nativity, chiefly in the way of its prophetic anticipations. The Introit, Gradual, and Communion, which sound as it were the key-note of the Mass, are employed in giving to the words of David in the Psalms their true prophetic import and bearing upon the event which the Church is on the point of announcing. There is something to our minds inexpressibly beautiful in the way in which these dim foreshadowings of the old dispensation are blended, in the composition of the Mass, with just so much of the history of their verification as is necessary to throw light upon their intention. It seems (if we may presume to interpret the mind of the Church by the feeble light of our own intellectual or æsthetical perceptions), the very normal idea of the Midnight Mass of the

* A beautiful instance of this occurs in the "Communion" of the Sunday within the Octave of the Epiphany, when the Church restores the precedence of the Blessed Virgin over S. Joseph, which our Lady's humility had led her to forego, by changing the Scriptural words of the Gospel, "*Pater Tuus et ego dolentes,*" &c., into "*Ego et pater Tuus.*"

Nativity. The second, or Mass of Daybreak, throws off somewhat of the character of prophetic adumbration which distinguishes its predecessor, and takes up the theme in its more simply historical form. It treats the Nativity as an accomplished fact, and, so far as it calls prophecy to its aid, it has recourse, not so much to the dark intimations of the Psalms, as to the vivid, graphic, and almost historical portraiture which the coming of the Messiah receives in the gorgeous language of the prophet Isaias. As in the former Mass, what would be technically called the "relief" of the picture is attained by the juxtaposition of the Angelic Vision, as seen by the shepherds in the field, with the dark sayings of the Psalmist, so in this, the same sentiment of touching contrast seems to be effected by the combination of those glowing and magnificent words of the prophet with the exquisitely tender pastoral scene which is revealed in the Gospel of the Mass. The character, then, of the first Mass being prophetic, and of the second historical, there can be no doubt as to the sentiment which is uppermost in the third or Mass of the Day. It is eminently dogmatic. The Introit having announced to us in the words of the Prophet (which in this instance actually assume the historical form), "*Puer natus est nobis,*" &c., followed by a verse of a jubilant psalm as the expression of Christian joy at the announcement, the Epistle of the day contains the doctrinal statement of the Mystery from the Epistle to the Hebrews; while the Gospel proclaims, with all the emphasis which the expressive ceremonial of the Church imparts to the formula, the words of S. John which embody in the shape of a dogmatic symbol the great fact of the Incarnation, in which all that has gone before finds as it were its complement and elucidation, "*Verbum caro factum est.*"

The same power of concentrating the scattered intimations of the Old Testament upon the Mystery to which they refer, might be exemplified in many other cases, did we not prefer leaving to our readers the delightful task of following out such inquiries for themselves. One or two further illustrations by way of specimen are all which our limits will allow. We are prepared to admit that the principle in question is carried out with more conspicuous power in some of the mysteries of the Faith than in others. The illustration, for instance, of the Epiphany in the liturgy is, to use a very inadequate phrase, a masterpiece of Scripture "hermeneutics." It presents in a synoptical form the various intimations contained in the Old Testament of the Royalty of Christ and the Catholicity of the Church; ringing them, if the expression may be allowed, in our ears with reiterated assertion and dog-

matic emphasis, during the whole of the Octave through which the celebration is prolonged. Of all the Church offices this perhaps is the most *picturesque*. The Psalmist, the Prophet, and the Evangelist, all are pressed into the service of the Church to light up the Court of the Infant King, and to announce the predestined graces of His Kingdom. Protestantism has nothing of this. Its use of the Scriptures is utterly commonplace, essentially human ; involving no unity of idea, no consistency of purpose, no adaptation to an object, no intervention, as we just now said, of a living soul, but a merely contracted view attained by a merely mechanical process. Indeed the most Catholic application of the Bible which we know of out of the Church, is Handel's Oratorio of the Messiah. As to the overpraised Anglican service, it is a mere collection of gleanings from the Breviary, without the merit either of genius in the selection or method in the arrangement.

The Festival which immediately follows the Epiphany in the order of the Catholic year, and which brings out our Lord's office of Saviour as the Epiphany has done that of King, the Feast of the Holy Name, may be mentioned as another signal instance of the use which the Church makes of the Holy Scriptures in illustrating a subject of the Christian Faith. The office of Holy Week, considered in the same point of view, would supply matter for an essay, if not a volume, by itself. Passing over these and other intermediate celebrations, we shall briefly dwell, as our concluding instance of the Christian adaptation of the Bible, upon the wonderful office for the Feast of Corpus Christi. Nothing can be conceived more perfect in the way, we will not say of an exegetical paraphrase, but of a meditative and devotional commentary upon certain of the Psalms, than the secondary application of them in this office to the Mystery of the Blessed Eucharist, as indicated by the antiphon prefixed to each ; and nothing is more remarkable in the construction of the office than the very slight deviation which is made from the ordinary course of the Psalms, especially at Vespers, where four out of the five are those which commonly occur.

This versatility of application in the Psalms is one of their most marvellous characteristics ; and, amongst the internal evidences of their inspiration, perhaps the most forcible. As we ponder them we are reminded of the poet's comparison :—

As for some dear familiar strain
Untired we ask, and ask again ;
Ever in its melodious store
Finding a note unheard before.*

* Keble's "Christian Year."

Take the "*Dixit Dominus*" for instance. It had already furnished the keynote for Christmas in the words "*Tecum principium*," &c. In those "*De torrente in viâ bibet*" it contains an almost literal prediction of a circumstance in the Passion; while in those which follow, "*propterea exaltavit caput*," it points to the Resurrection. The words "*Dominus a dextris Tuis confregit in die iræ Suæ reges*" foreshadow the Ascension, and the fortunes of the Church. But the Christian sense even of this single psalm is not yet exhausted. The Priesthood of our Lord is illustrated, we should rather say commemorated, in "*Tu es Sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech*," words whose import the Church brings out in their application to the Feast of Corpus Christi by filling up the illustration from the history of Melchisedech's offering of bread and wine. With the same devout ingenuity does she pick out from each of the succeeding psalms of Vespers and Matins the precise jewel which is wanted to complete her circle for the ostensory in which she is to exhibit the Most Adorable Sacrament to the loving worship of her children. In "*Confitebor*" she finds "*Memoriam fecit mirabilium Suorum misericors et miserator Dominus : escam dedit timentibus Se.*" In "*Credidi*" we have "*Calicem salutaris accipiam, Tibi sacrificabo hostiam laudis, et nomen Domini invocabo ;*" the actual words introduced into the canon of the Mass. In "*Beati omnes*" the words "*Filii Tui sicut novellæ olivarum in circuitu mensæ Tuæ*," for which the Church finds an appropriate, though inadequate, use in reference to the holy sacrament of Matrimony, she here, by introducing, in the exercise of that allowable discretion of which we have before spoken, the word "*Ecclesiæ*," turns to beautiful account as descriptive of her children gathered together around her altars at Holy Communion. "*Lauda Jerusalem*," with which the Vesper series concludes, has the words "*Adipe frumenti satiat te.*" It would occupy too much of our space to quote further instances of the same mode of adaptation from the psalms of the nocturnal office, by each of which it admits of being exemplified.

The offices of single saints furnish many opportunities for exquisite application of Scripture language ; as, for instance, that of the Gospel respecting the widow of Naim, in the office of S. Monica. Other instances of the same kind are supplied by the use of the words, "*Effusum est in terrâ jecur meum*," &c., with the following psalm, "*Laudate, pueri, Dominum*," in reference to the great benefactor of orphans, S. Jerome *Æmilian* ; of "*Mihi absit gloriari*," and again, "*Stigmata Domini porto in corpore meo*," to S. Francis of Assisi ; of "*Dilatasti cor*

meum," to S. Philip Neri; and of our Lord's "Ignem veni mittere in terram, et quid volo nisi ut accendatur," to S. Ignatius; containing as these words do a kind of epitome of the history of his great Society; with many others of the same kind. But in these cases the Church rather deserves the praise of a "bonus textuarius" than discharges her office as a commentator upon the Holy Scriptures, and they are accordingly less appropriate to our present purpose.

It would be very unfair to contrast the Catholic view of the Bible, which we have been trying to explain, pre-supposing as it does for its due appreciation a certain amount of Christian erudition, with that which prevails among Protestants of an ordinary stamp: as, for instance, in well-regulated families where "Paterfamilias" reads, or has read to him, a "chapter" in the family circle on a Sunday evening; or where the squire from his curtained and cushioned pew derives his impression of the psalms of David from the alternate recitation of the rector and parish clerk. Indeed we are anything but sure that the particular aspect of the Holy Scriptures upon which we are observing is familiar even to all educated Catholics. Still it is undoubtedly one which not only appertains to the Church, but is characteristic of her in contradistinction to Protestant bodies. So far as Catholics have it not, it is because they fall below, so far as Protestants have it, or in any way approach to it, it is because they rise above, their religious system. Whatever the accidents of the individuals on either side, it still remains true that the one mode of viewing Holy Scripture, which makes a large allowance for the spiritual sense and Christian anticipations of the Old Testament, is eminently Catholic, Patristic, and Evangelical; whereas the other, which loses sight of the spirit in the letter, is exactly coeval with the period at which the Bible was first distorted into a rule of individual faith.

Yet it may still, perhaps, be said that we have set our mark somewhat too high on the Catholic side, and, by supporting it so largely from the Liturgy and Divine Office, have addressed ourselves rather to the clergy than to the faithful generally. We have already anticipated, and to a certain extent met, this objection, by observing that the Missal at all events, as well as the Vesper office, from which our quotations are principally taken, are accessible in the form of translations to all the educated laity, and are actually in constant use among them.

However, in order still further to meet this objection, we will now remove our argument altogether from the ground of the Liturgy to that of the practical and devotional study of the Bible itself. And here we must observe, in the first place,

that the profitable reading of the Holy Scriptures in their integrity, or, as the phrase runs, "the whole Bible," though claimed as a special Protestant distinction, really belongs to the Catholic Church alone. It is notorious that those who are loudest in their clamour against us for mutilating the Scriptures, are themselves the most flagrant offenders in this respect. Thus they dwell upon the Epistles to the disparagement of the Gospels, or upon the New Testament to the exclusion or depreciation of the Old; or, at all events, of certain portions of the Old; such, for instance, as the Canticle of Canticles, from which the Church derives some of her choicest treasures of instruction and devotion. The instrument by which Divine Faith penetrates the practical and devotional sense of the Holy Scriptures, viz., meditation, is essentially a Catholic exercise; and, under its influence, even the less educated members of the Church, whether as the result of their own devotion or by aids which they receive from the devotion of others, attain to a knowledge of the Scriptures which is something different in kind from what is possessed by educated Protestants, or even by Catholics who should read the Bible in a Protestant fashion. Though themselves possibly devoid of the intellectual power and imaginative vivacity requisite for the perfect performance of the exercise, yet by dint of constant teaching from the pulpit, of retreat-sermons, of popular devotions, and of all those methods of reaching the soul which the Church employs through the medium of the senses, they acquire a practical knowledge of the Mysteries of Faith which the Bible never seems to convey, except in the hands and under the guidance of the Church. An attempt made many years ago to introduce the spirit of Catholic meditation by means of a translation of S. Bonaventure's Life of our Lord was almost indignantly repulsed, even by Protestants who might, in a certain sense, be called Catholic-minded, as a kind of tampering with the letter of Scripture; as though it were possible to develope the treasures of knowledge which it often wraps up in a few words, without bringing in the help of such mental expansion. The Evangelist, for instance, has been led by the Holy Ghost to epitomise the history of seventeen out of the thirty-three years of our Blessed Saviour's life on earth in the three words, "subditus erat illis;" and those who have any acquaintance with the facts of the case are well aware how many souls have been rescued from the thralldom of the world and set on their way to high places in the kingdom of heaven, by the meditation on these words in the Exercises of S. Ignatius. Here, then, is one of many instances in which it is

given to the children of the Church to know those Mysteries which to others are involved in the obscurity of parable; in which Almighty God reveals to such as enter His kingdom in the spirit of babes what He has seen fit to conceal from the wise and prudent.

Our last illustration of the contrast in question shall be one which involves no conditions on either side beyond the scope of the most ordinary piety and intelligence. It is a matter, not of argument, but of mere experience, which will not be disputed by any body, that there is one religious subject upon which the Bible presents two opposite aspects to Catholic and non-Catholic readers. Upon the question of the character and claims of our Blessed Lady there is between those within and those without the pale of the Church a difference of opinion amounting to little less than absolute contrariety. By the great majority of Protestants in this country the name of the Holy Mother of God is well-nigh put out as evil. It is rarely mentioned, except by compulsion, or under a protest. Even by those who are not indisposed to entertain other Catholic verities with toleration and acceptance, our doctrine on the Blessed Virgin is the last to be admitted. To Catholics, on the other hand, this doctrine seems the necessary consequence, and even integrating complement, of belief in our Divine Redeemer. There is something in this fact which is quite preternatural. Protestants really are not aware how strong an evidence they unintentionally furnish to the view which the Church has always taken of our Blessed Lady as the especial enemy of heresy, and as intimately bound up in the elementary Faith committed to the keeping of the Saints. It is, we repeat, something positively more than natural, that she whom at any rate the letter of the Bible teaches to have been the true Mother of our Lord and Saviour, should be ignored by any of His professing followers; nay, that the one peculiar mode of honouring Him should be thought to consist in putting a dishonour upon her. This fact, as we have before said, is one of those which—do not *prove* that we are in possession of the key to Divine Mysteries, but—are certainly just what must follow from the fulfilment of our Lord's promise to His disciples, if actually fulfilled in Catholics.

Now it is the manner of Protestants to throw the whole responsibility of this behaviour towards our Blessed Lady upon the Scriptures. "It may be very well," they say, "for Catholics, who go by Tradition, to exalt her as they do; but we are Scriptural Christians, and we think that we are not more silent about the Virgin Mary than the New Testament itself. What is the fact?" they continue; "the Virgin is

not named more than a dozen times in the Gospels; and then with no extraordinary honour or commendation. Our Lord appears at times even to disparage her. As to the Old Testament, with the exception of a passage in Isaias, which merely predicts what is not denied, that she was to conceive and bear the Messias, there is not," they contend, "a single text in her honour adduced by Catholics which does not find its most obvious explanation in some other subject." But it is equally certain that there is another aspect of the Scriptural revelation concerning our Lady which involves no violence whatever to the literal import of the sacred text; on the contrary, which, we are prepared to maintain, is by far the more natural, and which issues in a totally different view of her character and prerogatives. We know so little of the high and holy reasons why the Bible is what it is, and not otherwise than as it is, that it is impossible to speculate with any prospect of certainty, or, indeed, without danger of irreverence, upon the motive to which its comparative silence on the subject of our Blessed Lady is to be referred. We can only conclude upon such matters *à posteriori*, and say that since the actual use of the Scriptures has been to form the rudimental type of the dogmatic teaching of the Church, such may be conceived to have been the intention with which they were indited. But at any rate it is plain what the Scripture narrative is *not*. It is not a consecutive history of events, nor a complete biography of individuals. It may, therefore, freely be admitted that its intimations on the subject of our Lady are, not only few in number, but in their character rather suggestive than descriptive. This, however, may be providentially designed for the very purpose of inviting meditative and devotional research. For the question is not how many, but what these intimations are; and again, what they are, not on their first blush, as we may say, but in their more recondite meaning and obvious implications. Let us, then, briefly consider them in order; not with a view of fully developing them, but merely of noting down what would be technically called certain points of meditation. Let us take first the Annunciation, and see what the sacred narrative *implies*. First, the unparalleled privilege of the Divine selection. Secondly, the character of the embassy, and the dignity of the ambassador. Thirdly, see what is implied as to the antecedents of our Blessed Lady. Fourthly, what is actually revealed of her prudence, her modesty, her humility, her faith, her obedience. Fifthly, let us survey this picture in connection with her age and her estate. Pass we on now to the Visitation, the next joyful mystery. See here another virtue of our Lady linked

on to the chain of her jewels, her heroic charity. Meditate on the effects of her Visit; the testimony of her aged cousin, and the communication *through her instrumentality* to the infant yet unborn of a privilege only less than her own. Consider the light hereby thrown on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Let us then follow up the same course till we have gathered in the treasures of the succeeding mysteries. And consider again what is implied about our Lady (still in the mere *létter* of Scripture) in the narrative of our Lord's first miracle, and again in the history of His Passion.

But it will still be said that very little is told us in the Gospels about our Blessed Lady's life. It will help us to meet this objection if we consider that life as divided into four great epochs. The first is between her birth and the Annunciation. Nothing certainly is told us of this period; but then what volumes of testimony are contained in the fact and details of the Annunciation itself! What if, as the Church piously believes, and as is all but stated in the very letter of Scripture, our Blessed Lady lived during this and the next great period of her history the life of a religious? Does such a life furnish many materials of biography, even were the character of the Scripture record biographical, as it certainly is not? And this thought is further illustrated when we come to the next period of her history, that, namely, between the Nativity of our Lord and the beginning of His ministry. For it is most remarkable that as respects this interval quite as much is told us about our Blessed Lady as about our Blessed Lord; indeed, the one is never mentioned except in connection with the other. The only events recorded during this period are the Purification and Presentation in the Temple, the Flight into Egypt, the Return from Egypt, the Losing and Finding in the Temple, the Return to Nazareth, and the "*Subditus erat illis*;" in all which our Blessed Lady takes a prominent part. This interval, moreover, as it was the longest in the life of our Blessed Lord, so did it form the largest portion in that of His Mother.

The third epoch in the history of our Blessed Lady is between the beginning of our Lord's ministry and His Ascension. It is quite consistent with the Catholic idea of her to suppose that this interval was passed, with few exceptions, in the same religious seclusion as her girlhood. She, unlike Him, had no public ministry to accomplish; and there is nothing at variance, but rather everything which is accordant, with the belief of her high dignity and prerogatives in the fact of this period being almost as devoid of recorded incident as is the hidden life of our Divine Saviour. The way in which she

passed the fourth and last period of her earthly career is indicated by the words, "the disciple took her to his own;"* and the estimate taken of her in the Church is proved by her occupying a place in the Apostolic Council on the Day of Pentecost.

Another thing is to be considered in regard to the deep silence of Scripture on the details of her history during those periods when that history would be separate from her Son's: as before the Annunciation, and again after the Ascension. It is at least imaginable—to our mind it is recommended by many considerations—that by God's appointment the place assigned to Mary in a Christian's meditation was always to be in connection with our Lord. Her joy was to be contemplated as arising from His presence, her dolours from His sufferings, her triumph from His glory. Now it is plain that this appointment would be absolutely frustrated, if we had been made acquainted by inspired authority with a course of events in which she should be the chief agent, and in which He should take no part.

Further, it may be said, perhaps, without exaggeration that, taking Scripture as a whole, there is as much in it about the Blessed Virgin as about the Holy Ghost or the Blessed Trinity (in their dogmatic aspects), and that her office and prerogatives are as well brought out. Apart from Catholic analogies and sympathetic appreciation she is a most marked personage. First, she is, which is certainly a notable distinction, "*the woman*," so designated by prophecy, so distinguished in our Lord's first miracle, so named when given as Mother on the cross. The Christian idea begins with the fall, in which three are concerned, God, man, and the devil. God mentions "*the woman*" *par excellence*, as a special object of the devil's hatred; and that before mentioning her seed. This of itself is a great distinction. "I will put enmities" (Protestant version, "enmity") "between thee and the woman:" herein is indicated the personal hostility of the devil against "*the woman*,"—of the chief first evil against this special human creature pre-ordained by God—and this by God's appointment. This is a grand distinction, inasmuch as, *ex vi termini*, the chief evil must be opposed to the chief created good. Moreover, it is the opposition of *fear*, because hatred implies fear, and fear implies an adverse *power*. This, then, is assigning her the pre-eminence in created good; she is set forth as beneficent power at enmity with malevolent power.

Again, it is a continuing hatred; successive, not in respect

* S. John xix. 27.

of the devil alone, but of all his kith and kin: "And thy seed and her seed," which implies *life* in "the woman," and participation of that life in others, on the side of good, just as of the life of evil in others on the devil's side. The word "seed" does not seem necessarily restricted to Christ alone, but to extend to His spiritual brethren: "Woman, behold thy son;" and that it is not confined literally to offspring is certain from the word being used also of the devil. In accordance also with this is Solomon's statement, that "God created man incorruptible, and to the image of His own likeness He made him: but by the envy of the devil death came into the world; and they follow him that are of his side."* Now those who feel no title to be called "sons of Mary," whether they read *ipsa* or *ipsum*, cannot deny that it is a notable office to crush the serpent's head, whether *per se* or by giving birth to her Divine Son.

We say, then, that, connecting the first revelation of God's will which thus exalts "the woman," with the last, which states "there appeared a great wonder in heaven, a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars," † Mary (unless these revelations do not apply to her at all), is described Biblically with as great relative precision and majesty as the Paraclete.

Even disjoining the Apocalypse from Genesis, unless the Blessed Virgin is not "the woman," she has a character of *supernatural* greatness assigned to her; because the part to which she is pre-determined by Almighty God is that of conflict with the supernatural power of the devil; and an ordinary human creature could not of itself be able to cope with a supernatural being. Observe that we do not allege these passages as declaring what this supernatural necessary condition was (fulness of grace, her immaculate conception, &c.), but only that it was necessary and supernatural; and it was also personal, because the supernatural enmity was personal against her. Observe also that these are not Catholic but Biblical deductions; that is, not traditional, but arising from the text as reasonable inferences. And they are, not theological, but logical deductions.

Moreover, this dilemma is created at the very beginning of the Bible. Either "woman" was the common appellation, and so the Protestant remarks upon our Lord's application of it to His mother are irrelevant and futile; or it is used exceptionally, and therefore with some peculiar significance; and the "woman" at Cana, the "woman" on Calvary, becomes

* Wisd. ii. 23-25.

† Apoc. xii. 1.

reasonably identified with "the woman" of Genesis, and the "woman" of the Apocalypse.

No reference has yet been made to the Canticle of Canticles, and we have left ourselves space but for one appeal to that wonderful repertory of Marian theology. We allude to the words "*Sicut lilium inter spinas, sic amica mea inter filias.*"* Most appropriately, as it seems to us, is this text cited in illustration of the Immaculate Conception. Let it be considered that "thorns" were the especial product of the Fall,† which imparted to the animal and vegetable creation, simultaneously with the wreck of moral and spiritual nature, those noxious qualities which they had not in Paradise. Now, if the inspired author of the Canticles had been specially directed to mark the prerogative of the Immaculate Virgin among the fallen daughters of Eve, it is hard to conceive an image more singularly exact than that which represents her under the form of the purest and loveliest of Eden's flowers amid the herbs of the field which bore especial traces of Satan's work.

Such being the place which our Blessed Lady occupies in the Gospels, supported as they are in their testimony by the more than allusions of the ancient dispensation, no conclusion disparaging to her claims can be drawn from the silence of the Apostolical Epistles, which may be attributed to that Divine economy in the order of preaching which proceeds to lay the foundation on which the whole structure of Christian faith is seen to rest. The doctrine of our Blessed Lady is not a doctrine separate from that of the Incarnation, but is included in it. For the Apostles, therefore, to have preached it with prominence, while engaged in indoctrinating a whole heathen world with the first elements of Christianity, might, we may well conceive, have had the effect of removing it from its true position and thus marring the proportions of the faith. From the first the Church held and possessed all truth, yet her whole doctrinal system could not, owing to her infant state in the midst of a persecuting pagan world, be exhibited before the minds of men, as in later times, in its full lineaments and proportions. Her teaching was consequently more gradual and consecutive, as the *disciplina arcani* of the early ages sufficiently testifies. We may add, also, that there are other peculiar reticences in the Apostolical Epistles, which both throw light on the particular omission which we are now considering, and themselves in turn derive light from that very omission. But to enter satisfactorily on this theme, would require a separate article.

* ii. 2.

† Gen. iii. 18.

Here, then, is an aspect of Holy Scripture, which, if not observed at first sight, implies, at any rate, no other pressure upon the actual text of the Bible than such as arises from a thoughtful study of the words, and a careful collation of parallel passages; but which issues in the view of a certain great doctrine, diametrically opposed to that which the majority of religiously minded Protestants regard as the only legitimate deduction from the language of the Inspired Volume. Which of these views is the truer, is a question upon which our testimony would be considered partial; but there can, we think, be no doubt which is the more reverent towards the Word of God; which, abstractedly, the more natural way of approaching what is, on the hypothesis, a revelation of Divine Truth, yet conveyed in an unsystematic form, suggestive rather than dogmatic, and oracular rather than historical.

We have waived throughout the question of the truth of the Catholic view; but much surely has come out, as we have proceeded, in the way of incidental testimony to it. It is the only view which brings out and harmonises the various portions of the Inspired Volume, and exhibits "the Unity of the Spirit" as pervading them all; which, secondly, secures to faith, humility, docility, and other attributes of the childlike character, the place assigned them by our Saviour, as necessary conditions towards the right understanding of His doctrine; which, thirdly, explains the promise of ubiquity given to the Gospel, since the Scriptures can become universal only by means of the Catholicity of the Church; which, fourthly, is borne out and confirmed by the testimony of Christian antiquity and consent. These considerations lead us to recognise the wisdom of that maternal care with which the Church guards the faith as well as the morals of her children. The subjects of Faith are no open questions upon which ordinary Catholics may take leave to differ, or claim a right of discussion. Nor is Faith itself a mere intellectual accident, but a divinely infused gift, which, as it may be guarded and strengthened by moral acts, so may it be imperilled and lost either by direct temptation or by the indulgence of doubts. These, indeed, are Catholic truisms which it is almost an insult to the reader to obtrude upon him with solemn emphasis. Nevertheless it is for this very reason that they are in danger of being overlooked. We heard lately of a master in a Catholic school under Government inspection, who, not in malice but through ignorance, considered it a duty to read Dr. Colenso's work in order that he might be *au fait* of popular objections to the history of the Old Testament, and so might be able to teach the Scriptures "intelligently" to the poor children under his

care. He was very properly bidden to give up the work into the hands of his priest, as nothing more nor less than a bad book dangerous to Faith; a piece of advice applicable even in the case of books written without any evil intention, but which, from the nature of the subjects of which they treat, are unfit for general reading, however useful for professional purposes. No more disastrous state of things could arise among us than that Catholics should feel themselves free to admit without restraint or compunction any view of the character and intention of the Holy Scriptures subversive of or derogatory to that which as Catholics they are bound to hold, through the handling, without authority or a legitimate object, of works which advocate principles hostile to her teaching. The best preservative against such a danger is to be found in the diligent and devout, and, by consequence, really intelligent, use of the Scriptures under the direction of the Church with the light of her interpretation and in the spirit of her mind. Our Lord Himself, for the instruction of critics, infidel or ignorant, has assigned to Moses an office and proposed a dilemma rather formidable to commentators upon the Pentateuch. "Think not that I will accuse you to the Father. There is one that accuseth you, Moses, in whom you trust. For if you did believe Moses, you would perhaps believe Me also; for he wrote of Me. But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe My words?"*

* S. John v. 45-47.

ART. II.—RIO'S SHAKESPEARE.

Shakespeare. Par A. F. Rio. Paris : Douniol. 1864.

BELONGING as he did to a period of transition, when the Reformation in England had begun, but could not be said to have fully penetrated the masses, and when persecution made it the interest of many to conceal a religion which, though loth to change, they did not care to avow, it is not surprising that there should be some difficulty in determining for certain whether Shakespeare was a Catholic or a Protestant. In great measure unappreciated in his own lifetime, save by a few discriminating and admiring friends, like the heroes who lived before Agamemnon, *caruit vate sacro*. During the two centuries which followed a shadow lay upon his renown; and the incurious world, which only relished his plays when mixed with baser matter, left the subject of his personal history well nigh untouched. Causes like these, together with the comparative obscurity of his lot in life, combined to lessen the amount of evidence furnished to subsequent inquirers into the particulars of his career. And since the interest of men has been widely aroused concerning him, what scraps of evidence remained have been either woven together so fancifully, or have been so perplexed by the disingenuousness and prejudice of Protestant biographers, that no small patience is required to unravel the tangled web of his history, and draw aside the veil that has been studiously thrown over many interesting passages of his life. Even his works, partly from their objective character, partly from the unsettled condition of the text, do not go as far as could be wished towards clearing up the mystery. Mere accuracy of knowledge in matters pertaining to the faith which had so recently been universal in this country would not of itself prove that Shakespeare was a Catholic. He might be an adherent, outwardly and inwardly, of the new religion, and yet not have succeeded in unlearning all sympathy with the old. It took a long time to Protestantize the English nation down to the level which it at length reached. Years upon years of systematic misrepresentation, of dark calumny, and fierce persecution were required before the traditions of ages could be obliterated from hearts and minds so tenacious of the past as those of Englishmen ordinarily are. On the other

hand, when we come across passages which sound the praise of reformers, or uphold the principles of their reform, it is impossible not to remember that the author may have had many cogent motives for the expression of views which he did not himself hold; that honesty may have yielded to policy, and truth to the exigencies of the occasion. The strongest specimens, moreover, of Protestant feeling which occur in his pages may safely be pronounced to be of very doubtful authenticity.

But whatever may be thought of Shakespeare's claim to the name of Catholic, it is absurd to look upon him as the offspring of Protestantism. Precocious indeed would have been the growth of the new religion if it could so speedily have brought forth, and trained, and moulded a genius like Shakespeare's. And strangely unaccountable would be the style and spirit of his writings, always so respectful towards the virtues and offices which Protestantism holds in detestation, if he were really, as some writers would persuade us, thoroughly imbued with those ideas which have since become dominant in England. It is not like a thorough-going Protestant to choose for the matter of his plays scenes laid in Catholic life, to deal with those scenes in the spirit of enthusiastic admiration, to respect the sacraments, to revere the religious life, to appreciate humility and asceticism, to revolt from Bible-quoting, to abhor Puritanism, to cast ridicule on the ministers of the Anglican Church, and that, too, in striking contrast with his treatment of the unpopular priests of the old faith. Mr. Carlyle, amongst others, is on our side in this—that Catholicism gave us Shakespeare; and even Mr. Knight, with all his prejudices, and in spite of his energetic endeavours to upset all external evidence for Shakespeare's Catholicity, is forced to acknowledge that "his whole soul was permeated with the ancient vitalities." Curiously enough, however—and we say it with some shame—little has been done till lately in the way of protest against the strange liberties so often taken with the question of Shakespeare's religious belief. Goethe asserted the poet's naturalism, Schiller his idealism, but both regarded him as a Protestant of the first water. Vehse found in his writings "the simple, positive, biblical Christianity of Protestants; Vischer took him for a Pantheist; Gervinus converts him into a Rationalist, and an utter stranger to all positive religion; Heine glories in his Paganism; and some go so far as to accuse him of impiety, sacrilege, and atheism. At home, from Malone down to Halliwell and Knight, it has been taken almost for granted that, whatever else he might be, at least he was not a Catholic.

But we can point to no attempt of a serious nature to prove that he was a Catholic by birth, education, and choice, earlier than some very interesting and judicious papers which appeared in the *Rambler* during the years 1854 and 1858. There had, however, been another inquirer in the same direction, who, as he tells us, has paid attention to the subject for nearly a quarter of a century, and who has at length given to the world the result of his investigations. This is M. Rio—who thus apostrophizes Shakespeare at the end of his introduction:—

Thou art great, and still greater before God than before men, because to thy last sigh thou wast faithful to the religion of thy forefathers; because, alone of all the poets of thy time, thou didst not basely bow the knee before the royal or the popular idol; because thou alone didst raise dramatic poetry to the height of a poetry warring against falsehood and persecution; because thy sympathies were always with the victim, and thy sarcasms for the oppressor, whoever he might be; because thou didst defend, in the face of the political and literary powers of the day, the worship of the true ideal of heroism and religion; because, in the intoxication of thy glory, thou didst attain the heights of Christian humility; because all the pure and generous sentiments of which the soul of man is capable received from thee the most magnificent expression with which they have been clothed.

This is bold and enthusiastic language, and we shall soon see how far it is justified by proof. But before passing to an examination of M. Rio's arguments, it may be well to lay briefly before our readers the state in which the papers to which we have alluded left the question. And first with regard to the external evidence. By careful research into old documents, the writer proved beyond contradiction that *Stratford and its neighbourhood were far from being thoroughly de-Catholicized in Shakespeare's time.* The Lucys, Grevilles, and Comptons, indeed, were influential families on the side of Leicester and Protestantism. But the Ardens, Catesbys, Middlemores, Throckmortons, and Somervilles were no less staunch in their adherence to the old faith. With many of the latter Shakespeare was connected either by relationship, friendship, or dependence. His mother was an Arden, and the three families of Arden, Throckmorton, and Catesby were connected together by marriage. He was himself, it would appear, for some time a resident in the house of Edward Arden of Parkhall, afterwards a martyr for the faith. If this be so, he is brought into a relation with the Somervilles, far closer and more important than could simply be inferred from the intimacy of his grandmother and aunt, or cousin, with that family. Young John Somerville was a Catholic of warm feelings and weak head, who at the age of twenty had married

Margaret, the daughter of Edward Arden of Parkhall. This was in 1580; and in 1583 the young man in a fit of craziness set out for London on the mad project of shooting the queen. He betrayed his design by an excited speech in an inn at Oxford, and being secured and put to the torture, he involved by his confession the Ardens also in his ruin. He was himself strangled in Newgate; Arden suffered in Smithfield; and others of both families were for a long time imprisoned in the Tower. Now this young man at the time of his marriage requested Arden's page, who had been six years in the family, to be his secretary and manager of his law affairs. Suppose this page to have been Shakespeare, and what light is thrown upon his early biography! Malone, Collier, and, more recently, the late Lord Campbell, considered that there was ample evidence in Shakespeare's plays of his having studied law, and, in fact, of his having had a practical acquaintance with legal affairs. His youth—for he must then have been only sixteen years of age—was probably more than compensated by his ability; and whoever the person was whom Somerville employed, he could not, considering the office he held in Arden's household, have been much older. On this hypothesis, there is no difficulty in accounting for the well-known but otherwise mysterious enmity between Shakespeare and Sir Thomas Lucy. For this man was a tool of Leicester's, a Puritan much given to persecuting; and in his house it was that Wilkes, the commissioner sent by Walsingham to hunt out the Ardens and others compromised by Somerville, established his head-quarters. It was about this very year that Lucy is proved to have persecuted the Papists; and it was probably about this time, or not long after, that Shakespeare escaped to London, evidently to be out of the way of a man who is reported to have had him "oft whipt, and sometimes imprisoned," and upon whom he revenged himself by the sharpest satirical attacks, and, above all, by making him the Justice Shallow of the "Merry Wives of Windsor" and of "King Henry IV." There are many other incidents—such as the naming of the children, Hamlet and Judith, born to him in 1585—and the traditions concerning his employment, and the causes of his departure to London, which chime in naturally enough with this view.

But to return to his family, and in particular to his father, whom Mr. Knight triumphantly proclaims to have been a Protestant, at least so early as 1568, when the poet was only four years old. It is not necessary to take to pieces proofs so flimsy as those put forward by Mr. Knight. Suffice it to say, that the writer in the *Rambler* has shown that John Shakespeare must have been a Catholic in 1558, and that in 1568-9, when

he held the office of high-bailiff of Stratford, there was nothing in his holding that office at all inconsistent with his being a Catholic. For the oath of supremacy, though enacted ten years before, was by no means generally enforced till some years after. It was not till 1579 that justices of the peace were called upon to take the oath; and in that year one-third of the justices of Warwickshire, amongst whom were a Throckmorton and an Arden, refused to comply. Why then need it be supposed that John Shakespeare had the oath tendered to him in 1568—a year when Robert Middlemore, the recusant, was sheriff of the county, and refused himself to take what Mr. Knight would have us believe he imposed upon the high-bailiff of Stratford? The town was still in great measure Catholic, and John Shakespeare was the tenant of the chief man of the place—that William Clopton who built the fine bridge of Stratford, and enriched the town with its guild chapel; who was, moreover, a great hater of novelties, had been swindled out of part of his estates by a rascal, named Bott, in the interest of the Grevilles, and who, with a strong party of friends at his back, waged a sort of petty warfare with the Lucys, Grevilles, and Combes. It is curious also to observe that John Shakespeare began to go down in the world precisely at the time that Protestantism gained the ascendant in Stratford, and that he went to reside out of town shortly after the induction of a vicar who was a zealous preacher of the new doctrines. In 1586 he was turned out of the corporation for non-attendance at the “halls,” and in 1592 appears in the list of recusants as not coming to church “for fear of process for debt.” On other days he could manage well enough to show himself abroad, and therefore we may safely conclude that he availed himself of the excuse of debt on the same grounds as other recusants of his time. To crown all, a will was found in 1770, in the rafters of John Shakespeare’s house in Henley Street, purporting to have been his will. It is eminently Catholic throughout, is drawn up in the style of similar forms well known to Catholics and certainly in use at that time, bears no traces of forgery, and may have been stowed away by him in dangerous times in the very place where it was subsequently found. In 1601 John Shakespeare died, worried to the last by his Protestant enemies, the Grevilles. No wonder, then, that a monument was not raised to his memory in the Protestant church; for it was no uncommon thing in those days for the clergy to pursue recusants after death with indignities of a piece with those inflicted upon them during life.

As to William Shakespeare himself, in addition to the

indications of his religion given above, it may be added that the hypothesis of his being a Catholic, and having been married privately by some priest—and then, for fear of persecution, some time later getting a licence from the Bishop of Worcester to colour his illegal act—is the only one which saves the poet's reputation for morality; for his eldest child, Susanna, was baptized at Stratford only six months after the date of the bond on which the licence was granted. There is not a little ground also for connecting the play of "Richard II." with the plots of the Earl of Essex, who was continually visited in 1600 by the Earl of Southampton (Shakespeare's patron), Catesby, Green, John Arden, Wheeler, and others—all neighbours of the poet's at Stratford. The play was produced by Phillips, one of Shakespeare's company, probably with those additions applicable to the time and occasion which, for wise reasons, were not published till 1608. The very profession which Shakespeare chose, and the company in which we find him, look the same way. He is said to have stood as godfather to one of Ben Jonson's children; and if this be true, he must have been of the same religion as the parents, both at that time Catholics. The Gunpowder Plot was chiefly the work of men who were friends and neighbours of Shakespeare; and it seems to have been a crisis in his own career. On its failure, many gave up their religion; Ben Jonson was of the number; and after that time the friendship of the two poets seems to have been interrupted, at least for a while. Shakespeare retired to Stratford, and "wrote his 'Julius Cæsar'—a play in which, as in 'Hamlet,' all the sympathy is with the conspirators, who are represented as the noblest and most honest of men."

The writer whom we have followed does not endeavour to make out that Shakespeare was an edifying Catholic. He looks upon him as a fast man about town, willing to put his honour and his conscience in his pocket when the temptation occurred; one of those temporizers who amongst their more faithful brethren went by the opprobrious, but not undeserved, name of "schismatics," but, at all events, no Protestant; a man all through life opposed to the representatives of Protestantism, to Puritans, to persecuting justices, to oppressive and grasping landowners, to the clergy of the new religion. His sympathies were all with the old religion, the old priests, the old times and memories of Catholic England. And when he came to die he obeyed the convictions of his life. "Here we are not left without positive evidence. The Rev. Richard Davies (ob. 1708), in his additions to the biographical collections of the Rev. William Fulman (ob. 1688), expressly states

that Shakespeare has a monument at Stratford, 'on which he lays a heavy curse upon any one who shall remove his bones. —*He died a Papist.*'"

Nor does the internal evidence furnished by his plays in any way contradict these conclusions. They contain not a single word of disrespect towards Catholic doctrines, sacraments, or devotions. On the contrary, there is much that indicates an unshaken faith, and an adherence in theory, if not in practice, to the old religion. His favourite characters are such as Henry V. and the much-enduring Catharine. The butts of his sarcasm and ridicule are such as Henry VIII., Anne Boleyn, Justice Shallow (*alias* Sir Thomas Lucy), Puritans, and Church-of-England clergy. He has indeed "pandered to royal passions and popular prejudices on the subject of the Roman supremacy." Cardinals and legates fare ill at his hands, because they were to him the symbols and instruments of usurping Papal power. Whether he was himself the victim of the prejudices which he helped to instil into his countrymen, it is impossible to say. He may have been misled by other writers in respect of the characters of the two Cardinals, Pandolph and Beaufort. But if so, we cannot trace his errors to their source; whilst, on the other hand, materials were not wanting to him for the vindication of the men he vilified. In fact, it is no easy matter to clear him from the imputation of having invented many of the odious charges laid against them, with the intention, probably, of inculcating a general principle with the greater force, or, at least, heightening the interest of his scenes by the exhibition of striking contrasts—a poor apology, certainly, for systematic calumny. Against Wolsey he is less violent, but there are points, such as the fate of Buckingham and the exactions of Henry the Eighth's reign, about which he appears to have written either without warrant from or directly in the teeth of history. This conduct, if we are justified in our suspicions, implies at once great bitterness against the Holy See, and not a little unscrupulousness in giving expression to his ideas. The first we lament, but are not surprised at. Better men than he, both contemporarily and before his time, entertained similar feelings towards Rome, without in the least imagining that they were false Catholics, or dreaming of apostasy. Indeed, disaffection to the Holy See, or jealousy of its interference in any temporal matter, had long been so common amongst English Catholics, as to have become in a manner traditional amongst them, and to have assumed the form of a chronic distemper. Let this consideration qualify, as far as may be, our blame of the poet; and, as to the second

transgression, let us hope that in the intensity of his feelings he did not realize the real blackness of the crime he was committing. At all events there is no other topic, besides the supremacy, on which he can be said to breathe a Protestant spirit. We venture to say that there is nothing in his writings, and less than nothing in the notices we have of his history, to lead us to suppose that Shakespeare was ever guilty of apostasy from the faith.

But it is time to turn to M. Rio. He has divided his work into five chapters, with the following titles:—"Education of Shakespeare;" "Shakespeare in London;" "Shakespeare in his glory;" "The drama of Henry VIII.;" "The Star at its setting." We shall observe, as nearly as possible, the same order in the few remarks we have to offer upon some points in which M. Rio outruns the writer whom we have followed.

Upon the early days of Shakespeare M. Rio throws little additional light, except such as may be derived from the internal evidence of his plays. It is difficult to determine the amount of weight which can with fairness be attached to this sort of evidence. Arguments based on covert allusions, which at best are allusions only conjecturally, are apt to savour of fancifulness. What force they have is mainly accumulative. Singly they are of little worth; but if they all look one way, if they are consistent with known facts, if they uniformly betray personal feeling, if the poet goes out of his way to make or repeat them—then there is plausibility in their application, and fair room for argument, provided it be not too confident or over-strained. Apply these tests to the early productions of our poet, and it will be seen that M. Rio's only fault is excess of confidence—a fault very excusable, but tending, we fear, to weaken the faith of un-enthusiastic readers in his soundness of judgment and balance of mind.

On the one hand, Shakespeare's father had been exposed to constant sufferings for his faith. Fines, legal frauds, petty vexations, were his almost unvarying lot from the time that his office of high-bailiff had brought him into prominent notice. The poet was a child of four or five years of age when they began; but as they continued with little cessation till the death of his father in 1601, when Shakespeare himself had attained his 37th year, it would be wonderful if they had made no impression on his mind. It has been already seen that he had had multiplied experience of the rascality of attorneys, who were the ready agents of the powerful in cheating honest men, Catholics especially, out of their lands.

Probably also he had reason to feel strongly against the clergy and schoolmasters of the day. Catholics were not at liberty in the matter of education. Either their children were condemned to grow up in ignorance, or they had to be sent to Protestant schools. It may have been in the Free School at Stratford that Shakespeare made his first acquaintance with the ignorant pedantry and unbecoming lives of the class which he afterwards held up to merciless ridicule. Puritanism also had made head in the neighbourhood of his native town, and the ears of the observant boy must often have been assailed by hypocritical quotations of Scripture in the mouths of men of whose villany he was fully conscious.

On the other hand, there is peculiar bitterness in the language of Shakespeare whenever he touches upon subjects of this nature; a bitterness which is more marked in his early plays than in the greater works which he afterwards put upon the stage. In "*Pericles*," for instance, the poor fishermen seem to be introduced mainly for the purpose of giving utterance to the poet's feelings regarding the state of things in England consequent upon the Reformation. There were "rich misers" not far from Stratford, whom he might well compare to all-devouring whales.

"Such whales have I heard on a' the land, who never leave gaping, till they've swallowed the whole parish, church, steeple, bells, and all." (Act II. sc. 1.)

The devout wish of the other fishermen to "purge the land of these drones, that rob the bee of her honey," oppressing honest burgesses, and fleecing them of their hard-earned profits, was surely one in which the poet sympathised. The lawyers, also, in the same scene come in for a share of his indignation. How spontaneously does the thought of their chicanery occur to the fisherman's mind as he looks at the fish struggling helplessly in the net!

"Help, master, help; here's a fish hangs in the net, like a poor man's right in the law; 'twill hardly come out."

But deeper feelings and more stinging indignation animate his lines when he lashes those who cover their villany by quotations from the Bible. Nor does he seem to aim at Puritans alone. They, indeed, are not spared, any more than the specious pleadings of the lawyers, as the following lines from the "*Merchant of Venice*" sufficiently attest:—

In law, what plea so tainted and corrupt,
But, being season'd with a gracious voice,
Obscures the show of evil? In religion,
What damned error, but *some sober brow*

Will bless it, and approve it with a text,
Hiding the grossness with fair ornament ?

(Act III. sc. 2.)

But, as M. Rio justly remarks, Shakespeare on this subject sometimes flies at higher game, and reminds us that Leicester with all his fashionable villany was a zealous multiplier of Bibles. It is in the mouth of no Puritan, but of a tyrant as clever as he was bloodthirsty, that Shakespeare puts the well-known soliloquy :—

But then I sigh, and, with a piece of Scripture,
Tell them that God bids us do good for evil :
And thus I clothe my naked villany
With old odd ends, stol'n forth of holy writ ;
And seem a saint, when most I play the devil.

(Richard the Third, Act I. sc. 3.)

The same spirit appears in the lines :—

The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose.
An evil soul producing holy witness
Is like a villain with a smiling cheek.

(Merchant of Venice, Act I. sc. 3.)

Scarcely less remarkable are the evidences of his contempt for the clergy and schoolmasters of the new religion. They are never brought upon the stage but to be held up to scorn and ridicule. Sir Nathaniel and Holofernes in "Love's Labour's Lost," Sir Hugh Evans in the "Merry Wives of Windsor," and Sir Topas imitated, though not personally introduced, in "Twelfth Night," may well have had their counterparts in or near Stratford, when Shakespeare was a boy. He had better chances of coming across such specimens then than in his after-life in London. We cannot, however, agree with M. Rio when he says, "In another play he introduces a similar, or at least analogous character, under the significant name of Oliver Mar-Text, and he is hardy enough to throw doubt on the validity of the marriage tie when knit under such auspices. Nor is this all: the poet, forgetting the audience for which he wrote, and the surveillance of the police, draws an almost seditious contrast between marriage as celebrated by him, and as solemnized by a legitimate priest." Jaques dissuades Touchstone from employing the services of Sir Oliver, saying, "Get you to church, and have a good priest that can tell you what marriage is: this fellow will but join you together as they join wainscot: then one of you will prove a shrunk panel, and, like green timber, warp, warp." ("As You Like It," Act III. sc. 3.) But before an argument can be drawn from these words we ought to be sure that Jaques is speaking the senti-

ments of the poet; that the contrast drawn is really between an Anglican minister and a Catholic priest, and not rather between the unlicensed curate and the respectable beneficed clergyman, both of them ministers of the Establishment; and that the invalidity hinted at is, not technical and legal, but purely sacramental. M. Rio does not establish these points; and we must say that Jaques's own language implies a different interpretation. "Will you," he says, "being a man of your breeding, be married under a bush, like a beggar?" The appeal is to Touchstone's notions of respectability, not to his views of sacramental efficacy; and no stress can be laid upon the title of priest, as Sir Oliver himself, in another place, is so styled. "The priest," says Audrey, "was good enough, for all the old gentleman's saying." (Act V. sc. 1.)

Much emphasis is laid by M. Rio, in the next chapter, upon the names given by Shakespeare to the twins born to him in 1585. The poet seized, he thinks, that opportunity as the first good one afforded him of a public display of hostility to the State-Church. That Church had recently declared the book of Judith to be apocryphal; and its ministers, in the person of the Bishop of London, had brought about the cruel death of a man, named Carter, for having in a controversial work represented the triumph of faith over the Anglican heresy under the figure of Judith's victory over Holofernes. M. Rio thinks that no common courage was required to ask a minister of such a Church to give so odious a name to a child in baptism. The name of Hamlet given to her twin-brother is, in his eyes, still more significant. So soon after the fate of Somerville, the poet must have meant to pay a tribute to his memory. They were strange names to choose certainly, and suggest the idea of a special motive for their selection. The assignment of the motive, however, seems to us mere hazardous guesswork. At the same time it must be acknowledged that in all probability Shakespeare had already conceived the idea of his "Hamlet," and may naturally enough be supposed to have called his first-born son by the name of a character so evidently a favourite with him. The application of the play itself to contemporary history is another question. The legend, in its elementary form, had been printed in 1564, and no doubt occupied the mind of the poet at an early date; but when he first dramatized it we have no means of knowing. The earliest edition known is that of 1603. It was re-published, "enlarged to almost as much again as it was," in 1604. But the first draft should probably be dated much earlier. The supposition of M. Rio is that the fate of poor young Somerville and the relations existing between Elizabeth and Leicester are

the key to the meaning of the drama. Somerville was the counterpart of the Danish Prince; Elizabeth was the usurping Queen, a woman without modesty, bearing "a tiger's heart under a woman's hide;" Leicester, the "remorseless, treacherous, lecherous, kindless villain," well versed in arts of poisoning, and notorious for his profligacy, whom Shakespeare designed to paint to the life in Claudius. It may be so. There was cause enough for bitter thoughts, and Shakespeare may have meant mischief by his "Hamlet," even as the Prince himself did by the play—"the image of a murder done in Vienna." Strange, fascinating in its very strangeness, is the light thrown over many a scene in the great tragedy, if, indeed, the characters were not all the idle coinage of the poet's brain, and if the moral was craftily pointed by such words as these:—" 'Tis a knavish piece of work. But what of that? Your Majesty, and we that have free souls, it touches us not. Let the galled jade wince, our withers are unwrung." Certainly the thought is grand that in so noble a work Shakespeare should have intended to represent the effects on a soul of fine temper and exquisite sensitiveness of proceedings such as those which in his days were enacted in high places, and were bringing all manner of moral evil upon his dear and afflicted country. Imagine such a play acted before Elizabeth and Leicester! It would match in unflinching boldness and fearless power of rebuke the unexpected "Thou art the man!" addressed by Nathan of old to David. But why is there no trace in history of an action which, if it took place, ought to have made an indelible impression upon the national mind? Leicester died in 1588, Elizabeth in 1603. Perhaps it was not safe to bring out the piece so long as either of them was living. M. Rio thinks that he sees additional reason for supposing Shakespeare to have meant the later edition at least to have been a posthumous malediction on the memory of Leicester, in the fact that there are notable differences between the two editions of 1603 and 1604. In the first, Gertrude is not only ignorant of the crime of Claudius, but, when apprized of it, is eager to join her son in his design of vengeance. In the second, she is the willing accomplice of Claudius, as Lady Essex was of Leicester. And in the later edition there is a striking resemblance between the relations of the Queen and Hamlet on the one hand, and those of young Robert Devereux and his mother on the other. M. Rio accounts for these alterations by supposing Shakespeare to have learned in the meantime from Lord Southampton particulars of the English tragedy before unknown to him. And he is at some pains to prove that Hamlet, in the later play, is no other than the Catholic Earl of

Essex himself idealized. As in "Richard II.," a play not im-
probably connected with the plot of Essex, and intended to
serve his purposes, so in the amended "Hamlet," M. Rio
detects many traces of a mind sobered at once, and elevated by
affliction, more Catholic in tone, and more deeply imbued with
supernatural ideas. He sees in the lines,

There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Than are dreamt of in your philosophy,

an expression of disdain for the recently propounded philo-
sophy of Bacon; in the King's act of contrition, a special
and far deeper initiation in the mysteries of penance, mercy,
prayer; and in other passages—such, for instance, as that in
which he speaks of

The proud man's contumely,
The insolence of office, and the spurns
That patient merit of the unworthy takes—

the outpouring of a wounded spirit, and an allusion, more
bitter than plaintive, to the poet's own personal experience in
the interim. For ourselves, we confess to a feeling of con-
siderable misgiving as to the soundness of this style of
argument. Its ingenuity pleases, it addresses itself to the
imagination, and may easily carry it away; it is, at all events,
as plausible as the vast majority of speculations that we have
read upon the aims, views, and philosophy of Shakespeare—
nay, we could wish it all true; but to say that our reason is
convinced would be flat treason against all our ideas of logic
or of sober history.

There is far more reasonableness, if less of poetic interest,
in the sketch which M. Rio gives, in his second chapter, of
the state of English poetry and the English drama in Shake-
speare's time, with a view to show that he set himself de-
liberately to work to counteract the evils of which such
degeneracy was at once a product and a cause. Lilly,
Marlowe, Peele, Lodge, Greene, and Whetstone had all
dragged the muses through the mire, and prostituted such
talents as they possessed to the service of the popular idols.
Hatred of the Church, of Catholics, of the Pope, and of
Spain, as the principal support of the Papal cause, was the
main source of their inspiration, and they vied, on the other
hand, with each other in offering the gross incense of the
most servile flattery to those in power. Vulgarity and affec-
tation, in a literary point of view, licentiousness and blood-
thirsty hate, in a moral, were the leading characteristics of
their wretched compositions; and against all these Shake-

Shakespeare is supposed to have waged a magnanimous and single-handed warfare. M. Rio seems to forget that, in one point at least, Shakespeare had imbibed the spirit of his times. He does not allude to—perhaps, in the intensity of his admiration, he has overlooked—the fact, undeniable as it is distressing, that to him we owe the watchwords against Papal dominion which, to this day, are so unfortunately dear to the English nation. And we think that he has passed with too light a hand over the licence of language in which, from time to time, Shakespeare indulges—a licence which we would fain attribute rather to the age than to the man, but which his poems forbid us to think was, at least in his younger days, altogether unknown to him in practice. In all other respects, M. Rio is justified in saying that the poet never stooped to the moral meanness of his contemporaries. Few, perhaps, will succeed in persuading themselves, with M. Rio, that from beginning to end Shakespeare set before himself the glorious task of fighting the battles of Catholicism against the new Church; of reviving the ideas, fast disappearing in his days, of chivalry and asceticism; of smashing and treading in the dust the vile idols which fanaticism and State policy had set up for national adoration;—in a word, of counteracting so-called Reform in all its manifold operations. At the same time it cannot be denied that M. Rio has brought forward, and supported with no mean amount of plausible evidence, a series of very striking facts, all looking in that direction.

Thus, in his third chapter, passing to consider Shakespeare in his glory, M. Rio sees in “*Pericles*” and “*Titus Andronicus*” the unmasking of the poet’s first batteries against the enemy’s fortifications. These plays undoubtedly contain many indirect glorifications of Catholics and their belief, and not a few attacks upon Royal despotism and the devourers of Church property. We must content ourselves with a single instance as a specimen of many. In “*Titus Andronicus*” Aaron, a sort of ideal of depravity and fierce, unbridled passions—a demon in conduct and an atheist in creed—begs of Lucius the life of his child, as the price of his confession; of Lucius, who is a pattern of chivalry, piety, loyalty, and courage. His words, as he exacts the guarantee of an oath, are significant indeed:—

Luc.—Who should I swear by? thou believ’st no God;
That granted, how canst thou believe an oath?

Aaron.—What if I do not? as indeed I do not:
Yet—for I know thou art religious,
And hast a thing within thee called conscience,
With twenty Popish tricks and ceremonies,

Which I have seen thee careful to observe—
Therefore I urge thy oath ; &c.—(Act V. sc. 1.)

Less convincing to our minds are the arguments founded on such passages as that in "*Love's Labour's Lost*" :—

O heresy in fair, fit for these days !

or where M. Rio, identifying Biron with the poet himself, argues that Shakespeare is discoursing against the Protestant rule of faith :—

As painfully to pore upon a book,
To seek the light of truth ; while truth the while
Doth falsely blind the eyesight of his look.—(Act I. sc. 1.)

We are at liberty to admire the justness of the application made by M. Rio, but we are not warranted by the context in deciding that such was the poet's meaning. Biron is arguing against study of books in general, as more painful than profitable, as physically destructive of the eyesight, and intellectually injurious to originality :—

Why, all delights are vain ; and that most vain,
Which, with pain purchased, doth inherit pain :
As painfully to pore, &c.,
Light, seeking light, doth light of light beguile :
So, ere you find where light in darkness lies,
Your light grows dark by losing of your eyes.

Small have continual plodders ever won,
Save base authority from others' books.

Similarly strained is the interpretation M. Rio offers of an obscure passage in "*Midsummer Night's Dream*," where he supposes Oberon to allude (Act II., sc. 2) to Mary Stuart, and make a pious commemoration of her and of those who, to save her, plunged themselves in ruin. He ought not surely to have omitted what at all events is a sorry set-off to this tribute in the continuation of Oberon's speech—the famous lines upon the "fair vestal, throned by the west," who, though aimed at by Cupid, yet "passed on in maiden meditation, fancy-free."

We omit M. Rio's comments on "*Richard II.*," "*Romeo and Juliet*," and "*The Merchant of Venice*," in order to notice one or two points in his argument upon "*King John*." That play is founded upon another, the production of an apostate, Bale, who was rewarded for his crime by the bishopric of Ossory, and who, as Mr. Collier truly says, "was one of the most strenuous and unscrupulous supporters" of the Reforma-

tion. Bale's play contains the "most fierce and rampant exhibition of passion that ever assumed the ill-assorted garb of religious zeal." But how differently does Shakespeare handle the subject! Even Mr. Knight is constrained to observe this. "One of the most remarkable characteristics of Shakespeare's John, as opposed to the grossness of Bale, and the ribaldry of his immediate predecessor (there had appeared a play of the same name and character in 1591), is the utter absence of all invective or sarcasm against the Romish Church, apart from the attempt of the Pope to extort a base submission from the English king." We have already expressed our reprobation of the language Shakespeare stooped to use against the Pope, and his falsification of history whenever he introduces the representatives of the Papal court, as in the cases of Pandulph and Beaufort; but we are far from imagining that such passages prove much as to Shakespeare's real feelings. Upon this point in some degree, as entirely upon others, we would adopt the critical canon of the writer in the *Rambler*: "All objections, we think, to the Catholicity of Shakespeare, from the internal evidence of his plays, will be found groundless, if we examine *into whose mouth he puts the offensive words.*" The John of Shakespeare is the very reverse of the John of Bale. He is no longer a prophet, another Moses delivering the law to Israel, but a compound of craft, cupidity, weakness, and ferocity. Even when he defends the independence of his crown, he has an eye to pecuniary exactions from the monks. And it is worthy of notice that Shakespeare utterly suppresses in his speech the words "spiritual and temporal supremacy," which are found in the drama of 1591, as also the distich of defiance to the Pope upon which in that play the curtain fell.

M. Rio sees in the character of Falstaff another elaborate attempt to destroy a national idol. "This idol was Sir John Oldcastle (Lord Cobham), the chief of the Lollard sect at the beginning of the fifteenth century, the inspired martyr who, at his last hour, had given to the head of Christendom the title of Antichrist—in a word, the model of all truly *evangelical* virtues." Bale in his Chronicle and Fox in his Martyrology had extolled this man as another Precursor, but Shakespeare, according to M. Rio, makes him play Thersites to his Achilles—Henry V. Unluckily for M. Rio's theory, Sir John Oldcastle figured in an earlier play, entitled "The Famous Victories of Henry V.," as a low, worthless fellow, bearing the familiar name of Jockey, and though destitute of the wit and humour of Falstaff, at least a match for him in profligacy. There seems to be little doubt that Falstaff was originally

played under this name. He is called by the Prince "my old lad of the castle," and it is not unlikely that Shakespeare was obliged to concede so far to popular feeling as to change the name, for Fuller and Nathaniel Field both speak of Falstaff as a substitute for Oldcastle. Mr. Knight upon this remarks that Shakespeare himself, in the epilogue to the second part of Henry IV., disowns the connexion between Falstaff and the Oldcastle of history. "For anything I know, Falstaff shall die of a sweat, unless already he be killed by your hard opinions; for Oldcastle died a martyr, and this is not the man." But why should Shakespeare be anxious to repel a charge which had never been made? *Qui s'accuse, s'accuse*. We rather incline, however, to think that Shakespeare in these words playfully alludes to his own Oldcastle, who had been killed by certain "hard opinions" of his audience, and so "died a martyr," perhaps as real as the Oldcastle of history, and then deprecates any further objection by saying, "and this is not the man." No, not in name, but, perhaps, not the less so in fact. It is curious, that when he dies, he dies with words upon his lips not unlike those ascribed to the Lollard chief. His profligacy and hatred of the Pope are not combined in his dying speeches without some meaning. Shakespeare had come across many a libertine whose sole religion consisted in anti-Popery.

We cannot forbear quoting one or two of the passages which M. Rio cites in evidence of Shakespeare's sympathy with the spirit of the crusaders. Take, for instance, the following from "Richard II.," where the Bishop of Carlisle announces the death of "banish'd Norfolk":—

Many a time hath banish'd Norfolk fought
For Jesu Christ; in glorious Christian field
Streaming the ensign of the Christian cross,
Against black pagans, Turks, and Saracens;
And, toil'd himself with works of war, retir'd himself
To Italy; and there, at Venice, gave
His body to that pleasant country's earth,
And his pure soul unto his captain, Christ,
Under whose colours he had fought so long.

(Act IV. Sc. 1.)

The same spirit of chivalry and reverence, so unlike the temper of his contemporaries, is observable in the first part of "Henry IV.," where the old king in the opening scene declares his intention of levying troops:—

To chase these pagans, in those holy fields,
Over whose acres walked those blessed feet,

Which, fourteen hundred years ago, were nail'd,
For our advantage, on the bitter cross.

(Act I. Sc. 1.)

We need only allude to a similar passage in "*Richard II.*," where John of Gaunt, on his death-bed, reverts to those glorious deeds of chivalry for which England had long been renowned, so far "as is the sepulchre in stubborn Jewry, of the world's ransom, blessed Mary's Son"—words the more remarkable from their juxtaposition with Gaunt's mournful and prophetic vision of the monastic desolation which Shakespeare saw too truly realized. In such passages there is a tone of sincere conviction and pious admiration, which it would have been difficult even for Shakespeare's genius to feign. The whole of the fourth Act of "*Henry V.*" breathes a similar spirit, and shows that in theory at least Shakespeare knew how to appreciate the Catholic virtue of humility, and many another portion of distinctively Catholic feeling and devotion. Henry himself is evidently a favourite with the poet; he is, as the chorus tells us, "the mirror of all Christian kings"—we might add, Shakespeare's ideal man. But Henry V. is every inch a Catholic, "a true lover of the holy Church," and exhibits in his person a model of Christian wisdom, penitence, charity, and genuine humility. How intensely Catholic is every line of his prayer before the battle!

Think not upon the fault
My father made in compassing the crown !
I Richard's body have interred new ;
And on it have bestowed more contrite tears
Than from it issued forced drops of blood.
Five hundred poor I have in yearly pay,
Who twice a day their wither'd hands hold up
Toward heaven, to pardon blood ; and I have built
Two chantries, where the sad and solemn priests
Sing still for Richard's soul. More will I do ;
Though all that I can do is nothing worth ;
Since that my penitence comes after all,
Imploring pardon.

(Act IV. Sc. 1.)

Almsgiving, intercessory prayer, penance, purgatory, are all treated with respect, and more than respect,—with unmistakable affection. The whole course of Henry's conduct before, during, and after the battle of Agincourt, is full of that mingled grandeur and humility which those know where to look for who are acquainted with the history of mediæval heroes. The whole of the fourth act sets before us a simply Catholic idea of

the virtues of a warrior and monarch. Throughout, Henry is the brother of his people and the servant of his God, the thought of whom "runs before all business." His self-forgetfulness and spirit of gratitude towards God in the midst of victory, are no less remarkable:—

O God, thy arm was here ;
And not to us, but to thy arm alone
Ascribe we all.

His first thought and care are to render public thanksgiving according to the rites of Holy Church, and to treat the bodies of the dead with pious observance:—

Do we all holy rites,
Let there be sung *Non nobis* and *Te Deum* ;
The dead with charity enclos'd in clay.

Well might the chorus sound his praises, as

Being free from vainness and self-glorious pride ;
Giving full trophy, signal, and ostent,
Quite from himself, to God.

Still it must be remembered that the foundation of almost all Shakespeare's speeches in this play is to be found in Hall and Holinshed, and other older chroniclers. The merit of the poet lies in his choice of such a subject, in the care with which he brings out the Catholic excellence of the king, and the splendour of expression with which he clothes the somewhat jejune though enthusiastic narratives upon which he worked. And, perhaps, the strongest part of the argument for his own Catholic leanings is to be found in the fact of his setting up such a model as Henry before the eyes of the people and of the Court during such a reign as that of the Tudor Elizabeth. This showed, it must be allowed, some moral courage, though Henry's prowess had already secured to his name a degree of lasting popularity, which no religious changes could utterly efface.

In his fourth chapter M. Rio devotes himself to an elaborate examination of the drama of "Henry VIII." This is about the most satisfactory portion of his work, and it would be a pity to spoil an argument so dependent upon a variety of minute particulars by extract or condensation. Suffice it to say, that this play demolished the earlier one of the same name which had been written by Bale ; and that there is every reason, as is now allowed even by many Protestant writers, to suppose that the fifth act, which alone contains passages directly adverse to the hypothesis of Shakespeare's Catholicity, was a

wholesale addition by a later hand, and for a purpose too evident to need any comment.

In closing the argument in his last chapter, M. Rio's main endeavour is to prove that the plays of Shakespeare, taken in their chronological order, display an ever-increasing spirit of piety and Catholic feeling. Many are the examples he adduces, and they certainly tell in favour of his position. But, however inclined we may be to accept these in evidence of the poet's state of mind, we ought to know more about his course of reading, his circumstances, occupations, before concluding that his plays are the infallible record of his personal convictions. Much less, even if the data were most ample, could we take on ourselves to decide questions as to his interior state, which lie altogether beyond the province of the critic or biographer. Yet this is what seems to be the prevailing weakness of M. Rio's reasoning. He argues throughout too positively from the utterances of the poet to the character of the man. He seems forgetful of the sad truth, that the wiser, the more profound, the more gifted with brilliant powers of imagination a man is, the greater are the chances of his seeming to enthusiastic readers to have that which he has not. The light of conscience, powers of reasoning, powers of imagination, help a man wonderfully in recognizing true principles, drawing correct conclusions from those principles, and picturing forth in all beauty and loveliness even those supernatural ideas which have arrested his attention and captivated his imagination. Yet the object of his admiration is not therefore necessarily a reality to him. He may inwardly be a stranger to the piety which his writings express. Poetry may be religious in a high degree, but it is not religion; and it is more than possible—it has often been the case in fact—that sentiments, arguments, descriptions, which read most truly and are expressed most touchingly, have their source in nothing but extraordinary natural gifts, and a high state of artificial cultivation. It is natural, indeed, to put faith in a writer whose tone is generally high; but fine writing is a deceptive thing, and then most deceptive when special passages are dwelt upon to the exclusion of a multitude of others which offend against the first principles of morality, or display a vigour fearfully intense in protest against the supreme head of that Church of which M. Rio would make Shakespeare, not only a member, but an heroic and devoted champion. It will be said that Shakespeare proved by action the sincerity of his convictions. We do not call his sincerity in question; we believe that he was a Catholic at heart; we give him credit

for a desire to serve the cause of truth when he could do it without personal risk; we are sure that he relished the occupation of satirising the enemies of his hereditary belief. We see not a little probability in the supposition that, with perfect knowledge of the merits of both sides, he deliberately made up his mind to die a Catholic. But this is far short of the conclusions to which M. Rio would lead us, and would not justify our adhesion to a high-flown strain of panegyric which would raise him to the dignity of a saintly confessor of the faith.

ART. III.—EXTENT OF THE CHURCH'S INFALLIBILITY—THE ENCYCLICAL "MIRARI VOS."

Gregorii, Divinâ Providentiâ Papæ XVI., Epistola Encyclica ad omnes Patriarchas, Primates, Archiepiscopos, et Episcopos, August 15, 1832.

Œuvres Complètes de F. de Lamennais, revues et mises en ordre par l'auteur. Paris: Cailleux, 1836, 1837.

THE Encyclical "Mirari vos," as is well known, was issued by Gregory XVI. on occasion of his mounting the Pontifical throne; and comprises, among its other contents, an emphatic condemnation of certain errors advocated by Lamennais. It is no part of our present purpose to treat Lamennais's movement historically; we shall not inquire either into the grounds of his great influence, or into its permanent effects.* We are here concerned with his acts and writings so far only as they bear on these two particulars: the claim on a Catholic's interior assent possessed by certain doctrinal declarations in the Encyclical; and the precise force and bearing of those declarations. In order, however, that our readers may understand the use which we desire to make of Lamennais's works, it will be necessary to make a few preliminary observations.

No one is a Catholic at all who does not attribute infallibility to the collective body of Catholic bishops, when professing to teach the Catholic faith, as such, in union with their head. But there are two propositions which may be held by a Catholic, at all events without forfeiting his title to Catholicism. He may hold (1), that the Holy See is not infallible

* Some very interesting remarks on Lamennais will be found in the Preface to Professor Robertson's recent work, "Lectures on Some Subjects of Modern History and Biography," pp. xii-xiv.

even in those definitions of *faith* which it may put forth, unless the Catholic Episcopate expressly or tacitly adhere to them; and he may hold (2), that Pope and bishops united are fallible, when they condemn a thesis, not precisely as heretical, but as deserving some lesser censure. The former proposition constitutes what is commonly called the Gallican doctrine; nor have we any intention here of speaking against it. We do not, indeed, see how this doctrine can have any practical bearing on our controversies of the present time, when the great body of bishops are so loyal to the Holy Father, and so convinced of his infallibility, that they assent, as a matter of course, to his authoritative declarations.* But the second proposition, on the contrary, raises a question which was never so momentous as now; since at this particular period the chief danger to dogma arises, as is constantly remarked, from philosophical rather than from theological error. In order, therefore, to concentrate our attention on this particular question, and to prevent our readers from mixing it up in any way with the old Gallican discussions, we will suppose throughout that every Papal utterance for which we claim infallibility has been fully accepted and assented to, at least tacitly, by the body of Catholic bishops. It would tend to wearisome prolixity if we expressly mentioned this in every instance; we would, therefore, request our readers to understand that such condition is invariably implied.

We will enter, then, at once on the question before us; and will begin with one or two obvious but necessary explanations. When a thesis is condemned as heretical, its contradictory is thereby asserted as an integral part of the Catholic faith; and, conversely, every definition of faith implies a condemnation of the contradictory tenet as heretical. It is evident, however, that there may be many false theses, which are not in themselves heretical, but which lead by legitimate consequence to heresy; and many others which, though not leading to it by strictly legitimate consequence, are yet so connected with it in spirit and tendency that, unless expelled from Catholic thought, they will certainly introduce it. Now it is the duty of the Ecclesia Docens, not merely to preserve the deposit pure at any given period, but to watch jealously against the entrance of any dangerous element which may hereafter be

* Even on a point which no one alleges to be an integral part of the depositum—the necessity, under actual circumstances, of the Pope's temporal dominion—the bishops assembled in Rome (June 8th, 1862), say to the Holy Father, "Thy voice hath loudly proclaimed &c., *it must therefore be held by us all as most certain.*"

injurious to such purity. Accordingly she brands such theses as the above, but with less severe censures: they are pronounced "erroneous," "temerarious," and the like, according to the particular kind and degree of their theological unsoundness.

Now if she be infallible, as we are about to maintain, not only in her censure of heresy, but in these inferior censures also, it follows that there is an enormous number of *philosophical* truths on which she may infallibly pronounce; and this because of their intimate connection with the Apostolical deposit. We gave our reasons for this statement in our last July number (pp. 87, 88), and we need not therefore here repeat our argument. But further, there are certain *facts*, over and above those recorded in Scripture, on which, for the same reason, the Church may pronounce with equal authority. Of these "dogmatical facts" (as they are called), the most celebrated instance is found in the history of Jansenism. Five propositions were taken from Jansenius's "*Augustinus*," and condemned mostly as heretical. The Jansenists admitted the heterodoxy of these five propositions, but denied that any one of the number could be found in Jansenius's book; and they argued that the Church had no authority to control their interior belief on this head, because it was a question, not of doctrine, but of fact. The answer was obvious. Jansenius's book was so saturated with heresy and error, that whoever accepted it as orthodox would certainly imbibe the five condemned propositions, even though he should fancy himself not to hold them. This was quite imaginable and credible apart from any decision of the Church; and it is now infallibly certain, because the Church decreed those to be implicated in the Jansenistic heresy who were wrong on the question of fact, no less than those who might be explicitly wrong on the question of doctrine. Here, indeed, was a case in which those who refused assent to the Church's declaration of fact were accounted actual heretics; it will therefore be more directly to our purpose if we subjoin another instance where this extreme censure is not in question. If the opinion should obtain a footing in the Church, that the Pope's temporal dominion is not now necessary for the due performance of his spiritual functions, a most false impression would gain ground as to the real extent and character of those functions: the question of fact is connected with the question of doctrine. This also was imaginable and credible apart from any decision of the Church; but (as we must maintain) is infallibly certain now that the Church has spoken.* Canonisation again, is

* See our notice of F. Steccanella's work last July, pp. 218-220.

another instance in point.* From all this, then, it follows that, as there is a class of *directly* doctrinal truths, viz., those which are actual parts of the Apostolic deposit; so also there is a class of truths *indirectly* doctrinal, viz., those which are intimately bound up and connected with the former. We would beg our readers, therefore, to bear in mind, that wherever in this article we use the word doctrine, and its derivatives, we intend to include *both* the above-named classes.

There are various methods by which the Holy Father is in the habit of uttering those lesser censures which are our special subject. Sometimes he does so by expressly ordering some decree of a Roman Congregation to be promulgated, sometimes by a declaration emanating directly from himself. Then as to his immediate decisions, we find that they are given in two different ways. In many cases he puts out a formal decree; he accurately specifies or "formulises" the objectionable tenets; and censures them with no less precision and solemnity than he uses in condemning heresy itself. Thus (to mention no other instances), Alexander VIII., in his decrees of Sept. 24, 1665, and March 18, 1666, having recounted 45 theses, "condemns and prohibits them as being at least scandalous;" and Innocent XII. makes 23 extracts from Fénelon's work, pronouncing them respectively scandalous, erroneous, &c. Nay, it often happens, as in Leo X.'s condemnation of Luther, Clement XI.'s of Quesnel, and many others, that the very same document condemns certain theses as heretical and others as unsound in some lesser degree. Here, then, we have one kind of Papal declaration, containing a formulised teaching and a formulised censure. But not all Papal censures are delivered in this form. Thus Pius IX.'s condemnation of Frohschammer, and, again, his late brief, were in the form of a letter addressed to the Archbishop of Munich; his more specific condemnation of Günther was contained in a letter addressed to the Archbishop of Cologne; and neither of the three was expressed in that technical, and (as it were) legal, form with which the former class of censures is invested. Thus also the "*Mirari vos*," with which we are more imme-

* "Some things have no connection with the subject of faith and morals, referring to the whole Church; but there are other things which have such connection. And, therefore, though the Roman Pontiff may sometimes be deceived in facts of the former class, the reverse is to be said as to facts of the second class, among which canonisation is counted."—Benedict XIV., *De Canonisatione Sanctorum*, lib. 1, c. 44, n. 4.

diately concerned, is in form merely the customary Encyclical issued by Gregory XVI. on his accession ; while it is written throughout in a free, flowing, and rhetorical style. A large number of similar instances might easily be added.

Now certain Catholics hold that even the Pope's formulised judgment, confirmed by that of the whole Catholic Episcopate, is fallible, so far as it pronounces any censure less severe than that of "heretical." So extreme an opinion, however, must always be confined to a very small number ; and we need not argue against it, because all which we shall presently urge for the infallibility of less formal declarations, applies *à fortiori* to these more solemn and formulised censures. We will only pause briefly to show how strong is the authority of theologians in our favour. De Lugo, for instance, thus writes :—

Doctors commonly confess that the Church's judgment is certain in pronouncing these [lesser] censures. Bañes says that it is *error, or close upon error*, to say that the Church can err in that judgment. Malderus says that he would be a heretic who should pertinaciously affirm this. Father Coninch says that *this opinion of Malderus is very probable*. Father Luisius Turrianus says that *it is error to say that the Supreme Pontiff can err in these censures*. I also think this either erroneous or close upon error ; because the *infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost promised to the Church* is not, as it seems, to be limited to those dogmata alone which are proposed and believed by the Church as of faith, but should be extended to all those things which the faithful are bound to believe by the Church's precept."—*De Fide*, d. 20, n. 108 and 109.*

Viva's name must be added to the list of those who regard it as actually heretical to deny that a thesis infallibly merits that censure which the Church pronounces on it. Lastly, Benedict XIV., a theologian so singularly characterized by caution and moderation, is not less peremptory against that opinion which would confine the Church's infallibility to a mere interpretation of the depositum. His subject, indeed, does not lead him to treat of censures in general : but he holds it as absolutely certain that the Pope is infallible in the canonisation of a saint ; adding that the only doubt is whether a denial of this infallibility be actually heretical or only censurable in some lower degree.†

These foundations having been laid, we will state as definitely as we can the proposition for which we are about to

* See the original quoted by us last July, p. 217.

† Viva, *De Thesibus damnatis questio prodroma*, n. 18. Benedict XIV., *De Canonisatione Sanctorum*, lib. i. c. 43-45. See specially the last paragraph, c. 45, n. 28.

contend. Let us suppose the Pope to put out some declaration which, whatever its form, is intended for publication (as is shown by the circumstances of the case), with the purpose of inculcating some doctrine on the whole Church as theologically certain, or of denouncing some tenet to the whole Church as theologically unsound. Let us also suppose that the Catholic Episcopate in general, expressly or tacitly, assents to this declaration. We maintain that the doctrine so inculcated is infallibly true, and that the tenet so denounced infallibly merits that particular censure which has been expressed; and that the contrary opinion is theologically unsound. We wish it, however, to be distinctly understood, that in this article (as already implied) we are concerned only with actual documents emanating from the Holy See: any other doctrinal decisions—such, for instance, as are involved in the Pope's promulgating some decree of a Pontifical Congregation—are external to our present argument.

For our proposition, then, as we have stated it, we will give three reasons, any one of which we are persuaded would by itself be amply sufficient.

Ask any theologians of repute what are those cases in which a doctrinal utterance of the Holy Father is not infallible. They will reply that it is not infallible unless he put it forth in his capacity of universal teacher; and they will add, if they are Gallicans, that it is not infallible unless the general body of bishops assent. No other exceptions have been ever suggested; and no other can be supposed without manifest theological unsoundness. Yet the case which we are contemplating cannot be included under either without an absolute contradiction of terms.

Then, secondly, he who accepts Catholicism, by that very fact accepts the *Ecclesia Docens* as his infallible guide to heaven. Now the *Ecclesia Docens* (so we assume) teaches that certain doctrines are infallibly true, as being integral parts of the Catholic faith; and that certain others are infallibly true, as being indissolubly bound up with the former. On what imaginable ground can any one accept her testimony to the former class, while he rejects her testimony to the latter? If she is mistaken in considering herself infallible on one class of questions, how can we take her word for her infallibility on another? No one, it is plain, could adopt such a notion without the gravest theological error: it leads by most necessary and immediate consequence to actual heresy.

These two arguments are so very obvious and irresistible, that we believe no Catholic really rejects our proposition as it stands. It is true, indeed, as we have already observed, that

some few deny the Church's infallibility in pronouncing, ever so solemnly, a censure short of "heretical;" and that many deny her infallibility in those less formal declarations which we are particularly considering. But, when pressed, they will allege, we believe, that the *Ecclesia Docens* does not herself claim such infallibility.* Specially in regard to such pronouncements as the "*Mirari vos*," they will express themselves somewhat as follows:—"The Pope" (they will say) "on such occasions addresses the faithful as a father who claims no infallibility might address his children. The Pope puts before Catholics his deep conviction on some doctrinal or practical matter, and his conviction undoubtedly deserves most respectful consideration from the elevated position of him who expresses it. He exhorts them to ponder well its grounds, and forbids them, at all events, openly to contradict it; but more than this he neither requires nor wishes."

This is an allegation of fact, and can only be met by an appeal to fact. It is for this reason that we shall call Lamennais into court, that he may testify the purport of his own condemnation; and we will show, in the sequel of this article, by evidence absolutely irresistible, that Gregory XVI., in the "*Mirari vos*," professed nothing less than to pass an infallible judgment on the errors brought before him, in his capacity of S. Peter's successor. We believe that the same can be shown as to other Papal utterances of the same character, in almost every individual instance. But such a procedure is surely unnecessary; for there is no human being who will admit the doctrinal infallibility of this Encyclical, while he hesitates in attributing the same quality to that whole class of Papal decrees which it represents. In fact, there is no one objection brought against the authority of other decrees which does not emphatically apply to this. The Papal judgment is not formally addressed to the universal Church, but only to the bishops. It does not purport to be a dogmatic decree, but an Encyclical issued on occasion of Gregory's accession. Passing from its form to its actual contents, they consist in an enumeration of the principal evils which at that period afflicted the Church; and one half of it contains no allusion whatever, either to Lamennais in particular or to disputed doctrine in general. When we come

* Zallinger, in a passage repeatedly quoted, lays down the principle which we believe that at last no Catholic will expressly deny:—"Papal constitutions have force only in that sense and within those limits to which the Pope intended them to be confined." Our acceptance of them should not go beyond the Pope's intentions, but neither (by parity of reason) should it fall short of those intentions.

to that writer's condemnation, there is no attempt at precise and scientific analysis, whether of the tenets condemned or of the contrary truths inculcated; but rather a copious flow of rhetoric—most impressive, indeed, and beautiful, but still rhetoric—and a certain tone of pious excitement, very different from that which pervades definitions of faith. Lastly, neither directly nor by implication are the condemned tenets branded as actually heretical. No other such Papal declaration of doctrine, then, with which we are acquainted admits of so many plausible objections against its infallibility as does this, of which, as we shall see, Gregory XVI. directly affirmed, at a later period, that he had issued it as a final and infallible judgment.

Before entering, however, on the facts of this particular controversy, we must conclude our general course of theological remark. And here it may not be misplaced if we subjoin one or two other instances, which may be sufficiently set forth without exceeding our allotted space, and which abundantly show how mistaken are those who think that the Popes do not claim infallibility for this class of decisions. Take, for instance, the following passage addressed by Pope Alexander VII. to the Rector of Louvain University:—

Unless *all the thoughts and devices* (cogitationes et consilia) of men, and specially of men of study (literis addictorum), *adhere immoveably* in the case of *all Apostolical determinations without exception* (in omnibus omnino determinationibus Apostolicis) to the firmness of that rock on which the Lord hath built the foundations of the Church, it is quite incredible into how many and great follies and insanities the activity (curiositas) of man's intellect is carried along a trackless way; and that the more, in proportion to the excellence of its strength and perspicacity.*

So Pius IX., when repeating his condemnation of Günther, says:—

The original censure of that philosopher's works by the Congregation of the Index, sanctioned as it was by our authority and *published by our command*, ought to have been amply sufficient, in order that the whole question should be regarded as having received its final decision (penitus dirempta censeretur), and that all who glory in the Catholic name should clearly and distinctly understand that obedience was altogether due, and that the doctrine contained in Günther's books *might not be esteemed sound* (sinceram haberi non posse).

And at a later period, as we observed in our July number (p. 85), he states as a *reductio ad absurdum* of some proposition which he censures, that to uphold it would be to imply

* Quoted by Cardinal Pacca to Lamennais, vol. xii. p. 129.

that his condemnation of Günther had been erroneous.* Then again, so lately as December 19, 1861, in addressing the Archbishop of Malines on some philosophical controversies connected with traditionalism, which had caused much excitement, he uses these words :—

Wherefore, expressing no opinion whatever on the merit of those doctrines which have excited the present controversy, and of which the definitive examination and judgment belong absolutely (*unicè*) to this Apostolic See, we will and command that, until this Holy See shall have thought fit to express a definitive judgment on this teaching, both their favourers and their impugnors shall abstain from professing and defending any one of those philosophical and theological doctrines as that which is the one doctrine, the true doctrine, the doctrine alone to be admitted and characteristic of the Catholic university (*veluti unicam veram et solam admittendam, ac veluti Catholicæ universitatis propriam*).

But there is a more general consideration, which is decisive ; viz., the notorious circumstance that such Pontifical declarations are never afterwards modified or revoked, though they may, no doubt, be authoritatively explained. Those pronouncements on doctrine which are but disciplinary may, of course, be reversed. Thus John XXII., not only as a private doctor inclined to the opinion that the Beatific Vision is not enjoyed before the resurrection of the body, but as Pope forbade any one to be molested for that opinion under the then circumstances ;† his successor defined the contradictory doctrine as of faith. All discussion on those controversies which relate to the "auxilia" of Grace, was once forbidden, except by special permission ; but there is no longer any such prohibition. Catholics were at one time forbidden, but afterwards permitted and encouraged, to advocate the heliocentric theory. But, on the other hand, who ever dreams of its being possible that at some future time a Catholic will be allowed to advocate the system of Günther, or of Frohschammer, or that condemned in the Munich Brief? Yet how is it possible to explain this contrast, except by the obvious solution that the latter class are regarded by the Pope, not as disciplinary enactments, but as final and infallible determinations of Catholic truth?

And this brings us to the third argument in support of our

* Our readers should be reminded that the declaration for which the Pope thus claims inerrancy, was in form precisely similar to the late Munich Brief. It was addressed to an individual pastor, the Archbishop of Cologne.

† Raynaldus, A.D. 1333, n. 467, "*donec aliud ordinatum per Sedem Apostolicam fuerit vel declaratum*;" i.e., "until the Holy See should issue either a different command, or else a doctrinal declaration."

original proposition; viz., its effect on the reception of philosophical truth. Even in our own memory, how many philosophical propositions have been condemned by the Holy See!—Hermes's general system and various individual propositions; Lamennais's general system;* Günther's general system and various individual propositions; French traditionalistic error; and others. Now we who regard all these condemnations as infallibly just hail them with joy, because every accession to the Church's stock of infallible truth is a matter of congratulation. But what have our opponents to say on the subject? They admit the duty of respectful silence towards any such declaration, but deny its infallibility. We may remind them of the obvious fact that truth is one but error multiform; and consequently that every true philosophical proposition is the one exclusive truth on that special question which it immediately treats. Their theory, therefore, amounts to this:—The Holy Father enjoys no infallible guidance in his judgment on these philosophies; but he is at liberty to select an indefinite and ever-increasing number of philosophical propositions and to condemn them. From the moment of their condemnation to the end of the world, no Catholic will be allowed publicly to defend them, or even profess his belief in them; and in all Catholic colleges every philosophical student will be taught that they are philosophically false and theologically dangerous: while, nevertheless, there is every probability (since the Pope has no infallible guidance in selecting them) that several of their number express the one exclusive truth on those questions which they immediately treat. Strange, indeed, is such a theory; but still stranger that it should be upholden by thinkers who profess to advocate with peculiar earnestness the unspeakable preciousness of truth and of intellectual liberty. In the name of truth they uphold a theory which hopelessly mixes up truth with falsehood; and in the name of liberty they advocate an intellectual despotism than which none ever was imagined, speculatively, more unreasonable, or, practically, more grinding and intolerable.

It is quite impossible that men can remain for ever fixed in so false a position. The ground—who can tell how soon?—must be felt by them as slipping from under their feet; they must take a step backward, or a step in advance. We live in anxious times.

But in order that our own views may be recommended to such men as these, nothing is more important than to avoid

* We are not referring here to the "*Mirari vos*," but to a later Encyclical, dated July 10, 1834.

the least tinge of exaggeration. We will, therefore, add a few explanations, to make clearer what is the precise proposition for which we contend. We suppose all through that the Pope is intending to teach the whole Church some doctrine as theologically certain. In the case, therefore, of any given document, we have to consider, from the context and circumstances, which portion of it *expresses* such doctrine; for many statements, even doctrinal statements, may be introduced, not as authoritative determinations, but in the way of argument and illustration. (2.) Many Papal pronouncements, though they may introduce doctrinal reasons, yet are not doctrinal pronouncements at all, but disciplinary enactments; the Pope's immediate end in issuing them is, not that certain things may be believed, but that certain things may be done. If the doctrinal reasons even for a doctrinal declaration are not infallible, much less can infallibility be claimed for the doctrinal reasons of a disciplinary enactment. (3.) Then, again, the Pope may give some doctrinal decision as head of the Church, and yet not as universal teacher. Some individual may ask at his hands, and receive, practical direction on the doctrine to be followed in a particular case, while yet the Pope has no thought whatever of determining the question for the whole Church and for all time. (4.) Much less, as Benedict XIV. incidentally remarks,* does the fact of his acting officially on some moral opinion fix on it the seal of infallibility as certainly true. (5.) Nor, lastly, can any conclusive inference be drawn in favour of some doctrine or practice from the fact of its not having been censured or prohibited. The Pontiff of the day, whether from intellectual or moral defect, may even omit censures and prohibitions which are greatly desirable in the Church's interest, or enact laws of an unwise and prejudicial character.

Yet, on the other hand, these qualifications must not be carried too far. As regards the last, for instance, it must never be forgotten that the Holy Ghost most specially watches over S. Peter's See, and restrains within certain limits those evils which might follow from the mistakes and shortcomings of its occupant. Then, again, although a single doctrinal answer, given, *e.g.*, to an individual bishop, and not published by the Pope, is not infallible, a series of similar answers given by different Popes under great variety of time and circumstance may well be so considered; and there can be no doubt that the unchanged and fundamental maxims of Papal government are infallibly sound. Moreover, the Pope is infallible,

* *De Canonisatione*, l. 1, c. 42, n. 13.

not only in teaching faith and morals, but in universal discipline; or, in other words, he is not permitted to make a law for the Church which cannot be obeyed consistently with sound doctrine and true moral principle.

We are not here going to argue in support of the statements contained in the last two paragraphs; we have but made those statements as fixing more precisely the limits and bearing of that proposition which our argument is directed to maintain. Nor even yet is our necessary explanation complete, till we have said a word on such doctrinal decrees as are put forth by the Pontifical Congregations. In an early number we hope to discuss at length this question in connection with the critical case of Galileo. Here we will briefly state the conclusions which we are to advocate. Such decrees are not in themselves infallible: yet they possess the highest possible authority short of infallibility; insomuch, that in all, except most abnormal and exceptional instances, a loyal and well-disposed Catholic will yield to them, as a matter of course, a certain kind and degree of interior assent.* Moreover, it not unfrequently happens that the Pontiff makes these decrees his own, either by specially ordering their publication, as we have seen (p. 48) on the first condemnation of Günther, or in some other analogous way. In this case, of course they become absolutely infallible.

Meanwhile an objection has been urged against our whole view, which some thinkers regard as very serious. They consider that "the gulf is infinite which separates what is of faith from what is not of faith," and allege very truly that our theory presents Catholic doctrine in a most different aspect. To us, their objection appears as unphilosophical as it is untheological. Is it the case in secular science that a line can be broadly and sharply drawn, such that all on one side of that line is absolutely certain truth, while all on the other side is quite open and undetermined? Is not the opposite fact notorious? Some conclusions are absolutely established; others nearly so; others, again, under present circumstances, are much more probable than their contradictories, yet by no means sure not to be afterwards disproved; and so, along a kind of graduated scale, we finally arrive at those on which, as yet, one side is not more probable than the other. So in theology. One class of doctrines unquestionably demands the assent of

* We will explain our exact meaning in the future article; meanwhile, however, we would refer our readers to some remarks in p. 78 of our July number, on the interior assent which would have been due to the Munich brief, even though its authority had been less than infallible.

divine faith. Of a second class, it is quite certain that they are infallibly true, and probable that they are an actual part of the deposit. A third class are beyond all doubt infallibly true, yet with no pretensions to be strictly of faith. Of a fourth class, it is more or less probable that they are infallibly true. A fifth class are almost certainly true, though not infallibly determined. And so by degrees we arrive at those on which every well-instructed Catholic has full liberty to take one side or the other. Thus the pursuit of theological science becomes one sustained discipline of intellectual docility; thus the student is constantly reminded that he thinks under the assiduous superintendence and direction of that Holy See whose continuous infallibility is the abiding light of Catholic doctrine.

We have argued, then, that not only certain doctrines are of faith, but that certain others are infallibly determined by the Church to be true, as intimately bound up with the former; and as the former class cannot be doubted without (at least material) mortal sin, so neither can the latter. It is always admitted, however, that where there is invincible ignorance of that authority on which the former class rest, the sin of non-belief is material only and not formal; and the same is even more obviously true as to the latter class. Here, moreover, an important distinction is to be noted. Those who are external to the Visible Church, however absolutely invincible their ignorance, cannot, of course, be admitted to confession and communion. But disbelief in those infallible decrees which are not definitions of faith does not exclude from the body of the Church; and he, therefore, who is invincibly ignorant of the obligation to believe them, has full liberty of approaching the sacraments.

We are now to show, from the data furnished by Lamennais himself, that so far as regards him, the "Mirari vos" was not intended by Gregory XVI. as a mere disciplinary enactment commanding his silence, nor yet as a strong utterance of personal conviction, but as an infallible condemnation *ex cathedra* of that writer's erroneous system. All our extracts under this head will be from the twelfth volume, containing the "Affaires de Rome;" and we will begin with the time when he and his two friends (Lacordaire and Montalembert) were in that city soliciting a judgment on the principles advocated in the *Avenir*. Under these circumstances they addressed a memorial to the Holy Father, dated February 3, 1832; and no words can be plainer than those which follow, as showing that the judgment sought by them was to be no mere external regulation of their acts, but their rule of interior belief:—

O, father (they say), vouchsafe to cast your eye on some of the lowest of your children, who are accused of being rebellious against your *infallible* and mild authority. Behold them before you; read in their soul; there is nothing there for them to wish to hide. *If one of their thoughts, only one, differs from yours (s'éloigne des vôtres), they disavow, they abjure it.* You are the rule of their doctrines; never, no, never, have they known others. O, father, pronounce over them that word which gives life *because it gives light*"—(p. 83).*

Lamennais waited till July in hope of a decision; but then left Rome, announcing that on his return he should continue the *Avenir*. He had not, however, gone further than Munich when he received a letter from Cardinal Pacca, dated August 16th, inclosing a copy of the "*Mirari vos*," and informing him that his tenets were condemned therein (pp. 128-133). It is important to observe that for all practical purposes this letter is to be considered as emanating from the Pope himself, for Cardinal Pacca calls it "the communication which his Holiness commissions me to forward to you in a confidential shape."† The cardinal says that his Holiness could the less decline to pronounce on the question, because "on every side the episcopate addressed itself to this Apostolic Chair to obtain a solemn decision from the infallible mouth of *S. Peter's successor* on certain doctrines of the *Avenir*." He refers Lamennais to the Encyclical itself as specifying "the doctrines which his Holiness condemns as *contrary to the teaching of the Church*," and, on the other hand, "*those which it is necessary to follow according to holy and divine tradition, and the constant maxims of the Apostolic See.*"

He ends a most touching letter with this beautiful passage:—

His Holiness remembers with very lively satisfaction the noble and solemn promise made by you, at the head of your *collaborateurs*, that you would imitate, according to our Saviour's precept, the humble docility of little children by an *unreserved submission* to the Vicar of Jesus Christ. That remembrance consoles his heart. I am sure that your promise will not fail. Thus you will console the afflicted heart of our Holy Father, restore peace and tranquillity to the clergy of France, . . . and labour as God would have you (*selon Dieu*) for your solid celebrity by imitating the example of that great man and prelate [Fénélon], the model of your nation, whose name will

* This passage had already appeared in the *Avenir* of Nov. 15, 1831; but they quote it in their memorial as showing their true sentiments.

† It would appear that, according to usage, the Pope does not write personally to an ordinary Catholic while under a cloud. All the communications from Gregory XVI. to Lamennais are addressed through some intermediary until the latter made (as we shall see) his pretended submission; then comes a letter of congratulation directly from the Pope.

ever be dear and precious to the Church, and who was far more illustrious after his glorious act than before it. You will imitate, doubtless, that noble example: you are worthy of doing so. I felicitate you on this by anticipation, and seize with pleasure this opportunity of testifying to you my consideration, and showing you how much I am your very affectionate servant.

Lamennais at once gave up the *Avenir*, and dissolved an association which he had founded "for the defence of religious liberty;" on doing which he received from the Pope a message of approval through F. Orioli, and another through Cardinal Pacca. But the cloven foot had already begun to show itself; for, in his address (p. 134) announcing his discontinuance of the *Avenir*, he very ominously refers to the Pope only as *governor* of the Church, and avoids all allusion to him as her *teacher*. "Hardly had my declaration appeared," he tells us (p. 137), "when men muttered words of distrust and discontent; it was not complete or explicit enough; it too much resembled the 'respectful silence' of the Jansenists:" or, in other words, the Catholic world began to suspect that he rendered *obedience*, indeed, to the Pope's *command*, but not interior *assent* to his *teaching*. These suspicions soon reached Rome, and the Pope addressed thereon a letter to the Archbishop of Toulouse, dated May 8, 1833, which is so momentous that we shall lay a considerable extract before our readers:—

We read with much pleasure the letter which you sent to us on the 22nd of April last year [i.e., before the "*Mirari vos*" was issued], in conjunction with other venerable brethren of the same nation. . . . It was delivered to us at a time when we had ourselves long applied ourselves to that care and thought [which was necessary] that, according to the custom and practice of this Holy See, having gone through that . . . weighty examination which was needed by the very nature of the case, we might *opportunistically teach all the children of the Church* what was to be preached according to the rule of sacred Scripture and holy tradition on that most sad subject to which yours referred. For, remembering . . . that our unworthiness presides over the Church under his [S. Peter's] name *whose faith resists all errors*, we well understand, &c. . . . This we faithfully performed by God's good help, and specially under the auspices of the most Holy Virgin, in the Encyclical Letter addressed on the solemn day of her Assumption to the Bishops of the Catholic world, in which, according to the duty of our office, we delivered that doctrine which is sound and *which alone it is lawful to follow* (sanam et quam unicè sequi fas sit doctrinam protulimus)—(pp. 359, 360).

Here, then, the Pope expressly states that he had passed his judgment on Lamennais's errors in his capacity of successor to S. Peter's infallibility; that this judgment was intended to teach all the children of the Church; and that the doctrine

thus delivered, derived as it is from Scripture and tradition, is that which alone it is lawful to follow. *Quid plura?*

Gregory proceeds to express his grief at the reports in circulation concerning those who were condemned in the Encyclical, and prays that God will give them a docile heart. On receiving this letter from the Archbishop, Lamennais wrote to the Pope, begging for an explanation (pp. 138-140). He states to the Holy Father that his obedience has been complete; that the *Avenir* has ceased; that the objectionable society has been dissolved; that the subscribers have had back their money; that it is for the chief of the Church alone to judge what is good and useful for her; and that he has resolved henceforward, in all his writings and acts, to remain totally external to ecclesiastical affairs. He concludes by craving instruction as to what he can say in order fully to satisfy the Holy Father's requirements. The latter replied by a letter addressed to the Bishop of Rennes, and dated October 5th, from which we will make a few extracts:—

We are astonished that he has said these things. We were justly and deservedly distressed on finding the expectation deceived which that first act [of obedience] had raised; for we regarded that act as a herald by anticipation (prenuncium) of declarations [emanating from him], whereby it might be made manifest to the Catholic world that he *firmly and solidly holds* and professes (*firmè et graviter tenere ac profiteri*) that sound doctrine which we proposed in our Encyclical Letter—(p. 368).

But this also was very grievous to us, that, whereas the same Lamennais acknowledged that it was our office to pronounce concerning those things which are expedient to Catholic interests, he stated in his letter to us that he should henceforth be external wherever there is a question concerning the Church and the cause of religion. For whither does this tend, venerable brother, except to this—that he reverences our supreme *authority*, but as yet does not show that he has submitted (*obsecutum fuisse*) to our *judgment* on this matter, and to the *doctrines declared by us?*

But we confess with joy that the promise now cheers us . . . which Lamennais makes in the same letter, that he is prepared willingly and holily to profess those things whereby we may be most certainly convinced of his filial obedience. He craves therefore to be instructed in words whereby he may fully declare this his resolve. To which request we send one only reply, viz., that in regard to the doctrine delivered in our Encyclical Letter—wherein certainly . . . new precepts are not imposed, but only those things which have been established by Apostolic and Patristic tradition—he should affirm (*confirmet*) that he *singly and absolutely follows it* (*unicè et absolūtè sequi*), and will neither write *nor approve* anything at variance with it (*nihil ab eà alienum se aut scripturum esse aut probaturum*)—pp. 370, 372.

On this Lamennais had recourse to a new device. He

addressed a letter to the Pope (pp. 143, 144), professing the fullest deference to the teaching of the Holy See in spirituals, but adding that his conscience forbade him from yielding such deference in temporals; and implying that certain parts of the "*Mirari vos*" turned on matters purely temporal. This short letter he afterwards expanded into a memorial (pp. 147-153) and forwarded to Rome through the Archbishop of Paris; and an answer was promptly received to it from Cardinal Pacca, acting again as the Pope's mouthpiece. The Pope had been persuaded, he says,—

that you would have followed the example of so many illustrious and learned men of whom history has preserved to us the glorious remembrance, who, when they were accused of advancing aught false or inexact, immediately had recourse to the Apostolic See, and submitted themselves (*s'en rapportaient*) to the responses of *Peter's infallible mouth*, who, in the sacred person of his successors, imparts, and always will impart, *knowledge of the truth* to those who seek it in the spirit of humility and in sincerity.

The letter to the Bishop of Rennes informed you what declaration the common Father of the faithful expected from you, in order fully to satisfy him . . . of your *unreserved and unequivocal adhesion* (*adhésion illimitée et non équivoque*) to the doctrine of the Encyclical—(p. 155).

The Pope had required of Lamennais that he should promise to "follow" this doctrine "singly and absolutely;" and the cardinal adds, in the Pope's name, that he should yield to it an "unreserved and unequivocal adhesion." Things were thus brought to a crisis, and at this juncture occurs the strangest part of the whole history. In the work before us Lamennais argues at length (pp. 157-165), against those parts of the Encyclical which condemn him, and declares that at that period "the more frequently he read it the more he found his perplexities increase" (p. 159). In this state of mind he went to the Archbishop of Paris, and (as he tells us, for the sake of peace) subscribed the following declaration:—

I, the undersigned, in that very form of words which is contained in the Brief of the Supreme Pontiff, Gregory XVI., dated Oct. 5, 1833, affirm that I singly and absolutely follow the doctrine declared in the same Pontiff's Encyclical Letter, and that I will neither write nor approve anything at variance with it—(p. 166, note).

The Pope, on hearing of this, sent him at once a letter of overflowing joy and affectionateness, which, one would think, must have bowed him to the earth with shame. This letter was dated Dec. 28, 1833. Lamennais showed his sincerity and gratitude by occupying the earlier part of the very next year in writing his abominable "*Paroles d'un Croyant*," against which the Pope directed an indignant Encyclical, dated

July 10, 1834 (pp. 381-410). On this Encyclical we need here only remark, that the Pope uses the strong word "defined" (*definivimus*) (p. 390), in speaking of that "Catholic doctrine" which he had delivered in the "*Mirari vos*."

We would further add that, as Lamennais expressly states, and as indeed is notorious, the whole doctrine of the Encyclical was "adopted by the bishops, not one of whom uttered a single word of protest" (p. 294). And we will appeal, in conclusion, to any one of our readers, whatever may be his shade of theological opinion, whether the facts which we have adduced do not abundantly and superabundantly establish the conclusion for which we have adduced them.

Since, then, the determinations of the Encyclical are infallibly true, it is an important and interesting matter to ascertain precisely what they are. The earlier part of it is entirely unconnected with Lamennais, or with disputed doctrine. Gregory gives as his reason for not having sooner addressed the bishops on his accession, the civil tumults which had been rife in the Pontifical States, and which he had been obliged to curb with severity. He proceeds to deplore the miseries of the time, which he describes as "the very hour of the power of darkness:" wickedness triumphs; science is shameless; licence is unrestrained; sound doctrine perverted; error of every kind fearlessly disseminated; the Holy See grievously troubled; the Church's divine authority denied; the Church reduced into slavery; and all legitimate authority brought into serious peril. One chief cause of these evils is to be found in the dangerous machinations of secret societies. Under these miserable circumstances he exhorts the bishops to be still more zealous than before in upholding ancient doctrine and submitting themselves to the Holy See. Here he adds, probably with a glance at Lamennais, that presbyters in every place must be absolutely obedient to their bishops, "*to whose fidelity the people is entrusted, and from whom will be required an account of souls.*" He then proceeds to denounce those who maintain that the Church's discipline is contrary to sound morality, and that her doctrine has become corrupted and obscured; specially he warns the Episcopate against the attacks both on clerical celibacy and on the Christian marriage law. At this point it is that he begins to direct his glance at Lamennais's errors.

We now come to another most fruitful cause of the Church's evils, viz., indifferentism, or that wicked opinion, which has spread in all directions through the artifice of evil men, that eternal salvation of the soul can be

obtained under any profession of faith, if morals are directed by the rule of virtue—(p. 334).

This, indeed, was no explicit tenet of Lamennais, who, on the contrary, had written ably against it; yet it is judged by the Pontiff to be really at the root of his sad errors. The next paragraph brings us into the very centre and focus of controversy:—

And from this most corrupt source of indifferentism flows that absurd and erroneous opinion, or rather insanity (*deliramentum*), that liberty of conscience is to be asserted and vindicated for every man (*asserendam esse ac vindicandam cuique libertatem conscientie*). To which most pestilent error a way is prepared by that full and unrestrained liberty of opinions which is spreading far and wide to the ruin both of religious and civil interests; while some men say, in the extremity of impudence (*per summam impudentiam*), that some advantage flows from it to the cause of religion. But "what worse death is there of the soul," said Augustine, "than liberty of error?" In fact, all those reins being removed whereby men are kept in the paths of truth, their nature (which of itself is inclined to evil) now rushing madly towards destruction (*proruente in præceps*) in very truth we see the bottomless pit opened, from which John saw that smoke ascend whereby the sun was darkened, while locusts issued from it to lay waste the earth. For thence arises unsettlement (*immutaciones*) of mind; thence the corruption of youth; thence a contempt among the people of sacred things and of the most holy interests and laws; thence arises, in one word, a plague more deadly to the state than any other, inasmuch as it has been known by experience from the earliest antiquity that nations which flourished in wealth, power, and glory, have fallen by this one evil, unrestrained liberty of opinions, licence of speech, desire of change.

We are here to ponder the exact force of this declaration; and first we must consider what is precisely meant therein by "liberty of conscience." We have heard that some Catholics regard this as merely referring to liberty *before God*: according to these thinkers, the Pope is only condemning the error that men are permitted by God to choose freely between different forms of religion; and is not referring at all to coercion by the civil power. But such an interpretation cannot hold for a moment; and there are three different reasons against it (to mention no more), any one of which is decisive. Firstly, the error that men are permitted by God to choose freely between different forms of religion is neither more nor less than the error of indifferentism, which the Pope has already censured; whereas the Pope speaks of the two errors as altogether distinct, and the one as "flowing from" the other. Secondly, the quotation from S. Augustine as to "liberty of error," refers to one subject alone, viz., its immunity from *temporal inflictions*. He is addressing the Donatists:—

Then Constantine first of all published a most severe law against the party of Donatus ; and his sons, imitating him, made a similar enactment. Julian, however, their successor, an apostate and enemy of Christ, gave to Donatus's party the *liberty of destroying themselves* (*libertatem perditionis*), and at length gave back to the heretics their basilicas when he gave to the devils their temples; thinking that thus the Christian name might perish from off the earth, if he schemed against (*invideret*) the unity of that Church from which he had fallen, and permitted sacrilegious separations to be free. He was succeeded by Jovian, who, dying very soon, gave no order on such matters. Then came Valentinian ; read what laws he made against you : then Gratian and Theodosius ; look at *their* enactments. Why are you, therefore, astonished at the sons of Theodosius, as though in this matter they ought to follow any other judgment than that of Constantine, preserved most firmly through a series of so many Christian emperors ? . . .

If you had your own way, you would not appeal against us to Constantine the Christian, but you would raise from hell Julian the apostate ; as though, even if such an event *did* happen [as Julian's resurrection], it would be a great evil *except to yourselves* ; for *what worse death is there to the soul than freedom of error ?*" (Ep. 166, or 105.)

It is these last words which are quoted by Gregory XVI. "What worse death can be inflicted on the soul," asks S. Augustine, "than that the civil power shall permit the profession of error ?" It cannot possibly be doubted, then, that this is the question on which the sentence turns—permission granted by a Catholic government for the profession of error. And there is a third reason also for the same conclusion, viz., that letter from Cardinal Pacca which was originally sent with a copy of the "Mirari vos." We have already seen that this letter is nothing less than Gregory XVI.'s authoritative interpretation of his own Encyclical. Now this letter, as we shall presently see, states that the Encyclical condemns Lamennais's view on "*la liberté des cultes* ;" but his view on that subject refers, of course, not to their being permitted by God, but to their being exempt from material coercion.

So much is certain. But what, then, is precisely that "most pestilent error" which the Pope denounces ; the error, viz., "that liberty of conscience should be asserted and vindicated for every one" ? Here an interpretation has been suggested by Protestants, extremely opposite to that which we have just discussed, but no less certainly unfounded—viz., that the civil toleration of religious error is condemned herein as intrinsically unlawful to any Catholic ruler. No Catholic ever dreamed of this interpretation except Lamennais himself, who, according to his own account, actually believed this to be the true sense of the Encyclical at the very moment when he professed his assent thereto (pp. 159-161). It is enough to say, in

answer to this suggestion, that Cardinal Pacca, *i. e.* the Pope himself, altogether disavows it, and that Gregory XVI., as is well known, answered a formal inquiry by saying that Catholics might, with a perfectly safe conscience, assent to the Belgian constitution.

These two extreme interpretations, then, are out of the question: and one other circumstance is also clear. The Pope is not at all pronouncing on the question what kind and degree of toleration should be granted under the various existing circumstances of European society: he is contemplating (and condemning) the broad principle, "that liberty of conscience should be granted to every one"—*e. g.*, to idolaters and atheists, no less than to Lutherans and Calvinists. In what precise sense, however, he condemns this principle we have yet to consider; and with the view to our obtaining a conclusion, let us first quote the relevant portion of Cardinal Pacca's letter:—

The doctrines of the *Avenir* on the liberty of worships and the liberty of the press, which have been treated by the editors with so much exaggeration and pushed so far, are also very reprehensible, and are in opposition to the Church's teaching, maxims, and practice. They have greatly astonished and afflicted the Holy Father; for if *under certain circumstances prudence requires to endure them as a less evil, they may never be represented by a Catholic as a good or a desirable thing*—(pp. 131, 132).

The general meaning of this sentence is abundantly clear; but when we come to a closer view of it, a difficulty is presented as to the sense of the word "doctrines." As we understand the letter, this must be taken to signify "practical maxims." Gregory XVI. is speaking, through Cardinal Pacca, of those practical maxims advocated in the *Avenir* as desirable and beneficial, which would encourage the toleration of every extremest form of unbelief. He rules that the prevalence of even such maxims as these may, under certain circumstances, be endured as a less evil, but that Catholics may never regard it as a positive good.

With this doctrine contrast Lamennais's theories:—

I thought [when editing the *Avenir*], and I still think, that Christianity and liberty [*i. e.*, the unreserved toleration of all error] are *inseparably united in their common root, and are the necessary condition of each other*"—(vol. x. p. 63).

What have Catholics to desire except the effective and full enjoyment of all those liberties *which may not legitimately be refused to any man*, religious liberty, the liberty of education, together with liberty of the press, which is the surest guarantee of all the rest?—(vol. x. p. 135).

That *which most retards the triumph of truth* is the support which material

force attempts to lend her—the very appearance of constraint in the essentially free domain of conscience and reason. No one owes an account of his faith to any human power, and the contrary maxim [is] directly opposed to Catholicism, and overthrows its very basis *—(vol. x. p. 157).

Lamennais, then, goes the whole length of saying that the concession of liberty to the extremest forms of error is an essential part of Catholicism, nay, is the intrinsic and indefeasible right of man. On this circumstance, then, a third interpretation may be built of that portion of the Encyclical which we are considering. According to such an interpretation, the Pontiff is censuring the "insane" tenet "that liberty of conscience should be asserted and vindicated for every man" as *his intrinsic right*. And it is plain that a Catholic might thoroughly condemn this tenet, while holding nevertheless that liberty of all imaginable worships is in truth a great blessing, and more in accordance with the spirit of Christianity than any different practice. But any interpretation which would account the Encyclical as compatible with such an opinion must break down in three particulars: it directly contradicts the remainder of this paragraph, the whole of the next, and the Pope's explanation of his own words through Cardinal Pacca.

There remains, then, that interpretation which, we are convinced, is the true one. The Pontiff mentions two causes as having contributed to the error which he condemns: firstly, the prevalence of indifferentism as a speculative tenet; and secondly, the practice existing in many places of allowing the freest scope and licence to every opinion, however monstrous. From these concurrent causes, he teaches us, has arisen that "most pestilent error," "or rather insanity," "that liberty of conscience should be asserted and vindicated for every one," however extreme his misbelief; whether as his indefeasible right, or, at all events, as the arrangement most beneficial to Christianity and most accordant with its spirit. If the reader take with him this simple explanation, he will find the paragraph most consecutive and intelligible; let him attempt any version substantially different, he will be entangled

* Of these quotations, the two last are from the *Avenir*; the first from the preface to its collected articles. Lamennais admits (p. 150) that "naturally Church and State are inseparable: they should be united as soul and body." And he fully expects that "the development of modern light will one day bring back to Catholic unity, not France alone, but all Europe" (p. 151). Most singularly, with all his ability, he failed to perceive that no nation can retain religious unity, even though she possesses it, unless the civil power co-operate with the Church. If every one, however wicked or foolish, is allowed at any moment to start a sect of his own, what hope is there that the country will escape the presence of heresy or schism for one single year?

in a wilderness of inextricable confusion. Let this, however, be carefully observed. We should not contradict the Pope's judgment (as he himself explained through Cardinal Pacca), by thinking that under the present circumstances of this or that country less evils accrue to the Church from the prevalence even of this unlimited toleration than would accrue to her from any other practicable arrangement. The Pontifical decree only implies that the existence of such circumstances is in itself deeply deplorable.

Many Protestants, however, are under the impression, whether from this Encyclical or from other circumstances, that whenever and wherever Catholics get the upper hand, if they be zealous and loyal to the Holy See, they will assuredly refuse to every non-Catholic sect all free exercise of its religion: nor can we be surprised that those who take up this notion are indisposed to give Catholics any large toleration in countries where the Protestant religion predominates. We cannot here enter at any length into this question; but we may in a few words express a general theory, which we hold to be certainly true, which is completely in accordance with the "Mirari vos" and all other decisions of the Church, and which, nevertheless, is absolutely clear of that result which Protestants impute.

Civil government more adequately performs its highest and most admirable function, in proportion as the true moral basis is wider on which the body politic is established. By the *moral basis* on which a body politic is established, we mean to express the aggregate of moral and spiritual doctrines which are regarded by all citizens as first principles—as truths which are no matter for discussion or argument, but which no right-minded person could dream of questioning—and on which the whole legislative, judicial, and administrative structure, the law of marriage, and the law of education are absolutely built.* But it is abundantly possible that this moral basis may not be even predominantly *true*; and in that case more evil than good may probably result from its existence. Thus, in the Southern States of North America it would appear that part of the moral basis on which society is

* "In all political societies which have had a durable existence, there has been some fixed point—something which men agreed in holding sacred. . . which was, in short, . . in the common estimation *placed beyond discussion*." —(Stuart Mill's "Dissertations and Discussions," vol. i. p. 418.) The whole statement, from which this is a brief extract (pp. 416-422), is, to our mind, one of the most admirable and pregnant historical generalisations which we have ever seen; and the whole has a close bearing on the principle which we are advocating in the text.

built, is the tenet that the existence of slavery is necessary to the healthy action of society. From this flows their absolute intolerance of abolitionists, and the summary vengeance which they inflict on those who fall into their hands. Of course, under no circumstances could such irregular violence be defended. But altogether apart from this, and supposing it were merely a question of judicial inflictions, since the moral basis of their society is so far not true, decidedly as we condemn the abolitionist errors, we should be unable to sympathise with this particular exhibition of intolerance. What we desiderate for the healthy existence of society, is not merely a wide moral basis, but a *true* one; and not merely a true one, but one which every individual has full grounds for knowing to be true.

Time was when society rested on no less extensive a moral basis than Catholicism pure and simple. This normal relation of Church and State has unhappily passed away; yet even at this day European society rests on a somewhat large moral basis, viz., belief in a God of Infinite Perfection, and on a somewhat considerable code of true morality. If at any time some part of this moral basis were assailed, society ought to put forth so much of repressive force as is necessary for its own protection. Within the last few months a very able English newspaper (we are quoting from memory) has supposed the case of an attempt being made here in England to practise publicly actual idolatry—to open, for instance, a temple in London, accessible to all, in which a graven image should avowedly be worshipped as master of the universe, or as one of its masters. The *Spectator* asks whether the people of England would tolerate this worship, and answers in the negative. We may put a less improbable case. Let us suppose that a set of fanatics began to aggregate themselves and actively to proselytise in behalf of polygamy or atheism; it is at least no paradox to say (as we say) that this nascent sect ought to be put down by the law's strong arm, and so much punishment threatened and inflicted as would be necessary for prevention. But now let us further suppose that hereafter some sect of Mormonite tenets forced its way through our defensive barriers and took root among us; insomuch that a generation arose of hereditary polygamists. We should certainly think that England had suffered a deplorable calamity, and had sunk grievously in the scale of nations; but we should also think that much more harm than good would be done by any further attempt to maintain the penal laws. Now we only wish that our Protestant countrymen were large-minded enough to see that the

zeal which they feel for monogamy may consistently have been felt by our Catholic ancestors for Catholicism in its integrity.

We are very far from being of the number of those who blindly admire everything mediæval, and disparage everything modern; on the contrary, we think that the Catholics of this day have many inestimable advantages denied to their forefathers. But we must ever contend that the relation between Church and State which existed theoretically in the middle ages, is the one normal relation; and that had the Church been enabled to continue her work of civilization under the same conditions, the superiority of modern times would not be (as it is) very questionable, but would have been incontestable and most signal. And just as the civil power in these islands would act rightly and laudably in repressing all attempt at the introduction of polygamistic or atheistic error, so in those days was it the sacred duty and high privilege of a Catholic monarch to repress all heretical inroads on Catholic peace and unity. So much material force was, at all events, legitimate, as might suffice for the purpose of repression; and, in estimating the degree of this force, one circumstance should never be forgotten, which, on the contrary, seems never remembered. It is the very idea of punishment, that he who undergoes it shall be in a far more painful condition than others are. At a time, therefore, when the ordinary condition of humanity was that of severe and continuous suffering,* it was an absolute necessity that punishment for every kind of offence should wear an aspect of pitilessness and sternness, which very naturally appals the modern "gentlemen of England who live at home at ease."

But so soon as the unity of Christendom was really at an end, and Protestantism took permanent root in Europe, the whole policy of repression needed to be reconsidered. And passing to the present day, let us suppose Catholics to be ever so predominant in numbers throughout a given country, so long as there exists in that country even one hereditary Protestant sect, we have no hesitation in affirming these three propositions:—(1.) Catholics are not required by the "*Mirari vos*," or by any other authoritative teaching, to withhold from that sect full "religious liberty." (2.) They would act most unwisely and (in fact) unjustly by attempting to withhold it. Nor (3) would the Popes urge them in an opposite direction. We admit that in such a state of things a certain

* See F. Newman's "*Scope and Nature of University Education*." Second edition. P. 273.

civil pre-eminence ought to be given to the Church, analogous in some respects to that enjoyed in England by the State religion. We mean, that it ought to be the one recognized national religion, enjoying such privileges as are implied in that condition; privileges, however, which would be perfectly compatible with the most complete toleration of other Christian denominations. Certainly, then, we make no unreasonable demand here in England when we claim that liberty from our Protestant countrymen which they would most assuredly receive from us were circumstances reversed. And the case becomes even stronger when we consider that if (as is reasonable) those only should be regarded as constituting one religious body who agree with each other on what they consider essential, it is doubtful whether any single religious body in England is larger than our own. We have spoken of England: as applied to Ireland, of course, the whole argument becomes indefinitely more powerful, as in that country the State Church cannot lay any colourable claim to being the Church of the nation.

So much, then, on liberty of conscience. The Encyclical next proceeds to condemn Lamennais's errors on the liberty of the press:—

To this may be referred that liberty—most foul and never sufficiently to be execrated and detested—that liberty of the bookselling trade to publish any kind of writings, which some men dare to demand and promote with so much violence (*tanto convicio*). We shudder, venerable brethren, in beholding with what monsters of doctrines, or, rather, with what portents of errors, we are overwhelmed—which are disseminated everywhere far and wide by the immense multitude of books, and by tracts and writings, which are small, indeed, in bulk, but in wickedness very large, and from which a curse has gone forth over the face of the earth which we lament with tears (*è quibus maledictionem egressam illacrymamur super faciem terræ*). But there are some, oh grief! who are carried away to that degree of shamelessness as pugnaciously to assert that the foul mass of errors thence breaking forth is compensated with sufficient abundance (*satis cumulatè compensari*) by some book which, in this so great storm of depravity, may be put forth to defend religion and truth. It is sinful, in truth, and condemned by every law, that a certain and greater evil should be purposely inflicted, because there is hope that a certain amount of good will be thence obtained. Would any one in his senses say that poisons should be freely circulated (*spargi*) and publicly sold, because something of a remedy is possessed, which is such that it sometimes happens that those who use it are delivered from destruction?

The Pope then gives instances, beginning from Apostolic times (*Acts, xix. 19*), of the constant solicitude with which in every age the Apostolic See has laboured to snatch evil books from the hands of the faithful. "Thence," he adds,

it is most clearly manifest how injurious to the Holy See, and how fruitful of vast evils among the Christian people, is the doctrine of those who not only reject the censorship of books as too severe a burden, but advance to such degree of improbity as to proclaim such censorship abhorrent to principles of true justice (*recti juris*), and to deny that the Church possesses the right of decreeing and exercising the same.

Our limits will not permit us to attempt any argument in defence of this emphatic judgment; for such argument could not be brief if it were at all satisfactory. We must content ourselves, therefore, with explaining what we apprehend to be its purport. The books to which it refers are of two kinds: (1) those which are undisguisedly criminal and flagitious; and (2) those which are argumentatively anti-religious in whatever degree. Lamennais never doubted, we suppose, that it was sinful in an ordinary Catholic to read books of the second class; just as Protestants would admit that it is sinful in an ordinary Christian to read atheistical works. But he maintained, at all events, that this should be left to each man's conscience, and that men's indefeasible rights were invaded if any external authority, ecclesiastical or civil, took measures to debar them from free access to such books. Here, however, as in the former instance, the Encyclical is not content with merely condemning him; it expresses a positive doctrine extremely contrary to his. By the very fact that books of the two above-named classes are accessible to all, a constant occasion of sin is presented to the weak and to the wicked; and the evils thence accruing are so frightful, that "we cannot sufficiently execrate and detest" the corrupt fountain from which they flow. Apart from the Pope's infallible authority, reason alone, we are persuaded, if men would impartially consult it, would lead irresistibly to the same conclusion.

So far, however, as regards the second class of books above-mentioned, two explanations of this decree are implied by the Pope himself in Cardinal Pacca's letter. It may easily happen that in some given time or place the prevalent practice of giving free liberty to every kind of argumentative publication, may really allow greater scope and latitude to the Catholic Church than would any other rule which could possibly take its place. Mgr. Parisis, in his most admirable "*Cas de Conscience*," maintains this as to France in the days of Louis Philippe;* and the same is true of these islands at the present time. But, secondly, even in a Catholic country, wherever

* He quotes the above paragraph from the "*Mirari vos*," and successfully shows its perfect consistency with his argument. "*Cas de Conscience*," première série, p. 96, note.

circumstances require the concession of "religious liberty" to Protestants, it is implied in the very idea of such liberty that they have full permission to argue publicly for their tenets. In this case, however, it is greatly to be desired that no further liberty of the press than this should be conceded; and that the advocates, for example, of polygamy or atheism should be prohibited by penalties from corrupting the national mind.

The third condemned error of Lamennais is the lawfulness of rebellion against the civil government. We could not even express ourselves intelligibly on this head without occupying considerable space, and we must, therefore, reluctantly pass on.

Fourthly, he is censured for advocating the breach of that union between Church and State which, says the Holy Father, "has ever been propitious and salutary to the interests of both."

Lastly, he receives a very sharp reproof for promoting associations among men of all religions in promotion of his cherished "liberty." This is explained, in Cardinal Pacca's letter, as having special reference to a certain document put forth by Lamennais with the following title:—"An act of union proposed to all those who, notwithstanding the extinction of Poland, the dismemberment of Belgium, and the conduct of what are called liberal governments, still place their hopes in the liberty of the world, and are resolved to labour for its attainment."

Gregory XVI. then, leaving all special reference to Lamennais, exhorts the bishops to fight strenuously the Lord's battles, and to cherish especially the sciences of theology and philosophy; but at the same time earnestly to warn students against a proud and rationalistic spirit. "We cannot learn God without God, Who through His word teaches men to know God." He entreats also Christian princes to co-operate with the Church's efforts, and make the advancement of religion their chief care. Finally, after an earnest expression of his trust in the most holy Virgin, and an exhortation also to invoke the protection of SS. Peter and Paul, he turns his thoughts to "Jesus Christ, the Author and Consummator of faith," and so brings this magnificent Encyclical to a close.

Our object in now drawing attention to the "*Mirari vos*" has not been an exposition of its contents (though this also is surely most seasonable), but chiefly a vindication of the infallibility appertaining to its doctrinal declarations; and this, again, not principally for their own sake, but rather for

the sake of that whole class of ecclesiastical utterances which they represent and exemplify. This vindication we hope we have satisfactorily accomplished in the earlier part of our article; and it only remains here to notice an objection which has reached us, from more than one quarter, in regard to similar statements put forth in our third article of last July. It has been objected that no important end is gained, while divisions are generated and increased, by obtruding on notice a doubtful and extreme theory. We must profess ourselves quite unable to understand the grounds of this objection. Consider the vast number of politico-religious questions, such as those determined in the "*Mirari vos*;" consider, again, the vast number of philosophical questions, such as those involved in the condemnation of Hermes and of Günther: how enormous is their reach, and how profound their influence! The whole mental attitude of an educated Catholic towards the Church and towards Rome is absolutely revolutionized, when he comes round from the contrary opinion to that of regarding her as infallible on such questions. At this moment great interest is felt as to providing a higher education for our gentry, and much difference of opinion prevails on the best method of doing so. But on one point all thinkers must be unanimous; viz., in counting it among the most momentous necessities of the time, that such education should inculcate true doctrine on the extent of the Church's infallibility, whatever they may consider such true doctrine to be. Never was there a controversy which it is less possible to ignore. Certainly, to insist on a doubtful theory as though it were certain, is most unjustifiable and tends to schism; but to treat a closed question as though it were an open one, is no less unjustifiable and tends to heresy.

Those who refuse interior submission to these ecclesiastical declarations, and those who fall into the kindred error of denying their due theological authority to the Pontifical Congregations, are usually, so far as we have observed, insensible to any amount of direct argument, from their concentration of thought on one particular fact of the past; viz., Galileo's condemnation. They regard this fact as decisive; it deprives us, they think, of so much as a standing ground in controversy, and justifies them in pooh-poohing us out of court. In a very early number, therefore, we will carefully consider this condemnation, so far as it has any bearing on these truly momentous questions.

ART. IV.—MADAME DE MAINTENON.

Madame de Maintenon et sa Famille. Lettres et Documents inédits. Par HONORÉ BONHOMME. Paris : Didier. 1863.

Histoire de Madame de Maintenon, et des principaux Evénements du Règne de Louis XIV. Par M. le DUC DE NOAILLES, de l'Académie Française. Tomes 4. Paris : Comon. 1849-1858.

The Life of Madame de Maintenon. Translated from the French. London : Lockyer Davis. 1772.

The Secret Correspondence of Madame de Maintenon with the Princess des Ursins, from the original manuscripts in the possession of the Duke of Choiseul. Translated from the French. 3 vols. London : Whittaker. 1827.

Mémorial de Saint-Cyr. Paris : Fulgence. 1846.

FEMALE characters have, for good or ill, played a larger part on the stage of French history than of English. We have no names which correspond in extensive influence to those of Mesdames de Sévigné, de Maintenon, de Genlis, and Récamier ; while the extraordinary power, both political and social, exercised by royal mistresses in France finds no parallel in England, even in the worst days of courtly profligacy. Nor is it easy to say to what cause this difference between the two countries is to be ascribed. It may be that public opinion has been brought to bear more fully on individual action here than in France, and acts as a more powerful restraint ; and it may be also that extreme prominence in society is repugnant to the more modest and retiring habits of Englishwomen. There is no lady in our annals who has occupied a position similar to that of Madame de Maintenon in relation to royalty except Mrs. Fitzherbert ; but she, though highly distinguished for her virtues, was altogether wanting in those intellectual endowments which adorned that gifted woman who won the esteem and fixed the affections of Louis XIV. Many circumstances combined to make her the most striking example of female ascendancy in France ; and the object of this paper will be to trace the causes which led to it, as well as to her being, to this day, an object of never-failing interest to the French people. Like all great women, she has had many virulent detractors and many ardent eulogists ; but we shall endeavour to avoid the extremes of both, more especially as M. Bonhomme is of opinion that her biography has still to be written. If there were no higher consideration, self-respect alone would

demand scrupulous impartiality in an historical inquiry ; and we are the less tempted to depart from this rule in the present instance because we are convinced that in Madame de Maintenon's history there is ample scope for the most chivalrous vindication of her fame, and that, as time goes on, and the materials relative to her contemporaries are collated, her apparent defects will lessen in importance, and her character stand out in fairer proportions and clearer light. It needs only to compare recent memoirs of her with the jejune attempts of the last century, to perceive how much her cause gains from fuller and closer investigation. The Duc de Noailles has rendered good service to the literature of his country by his voluminous history of this lady, conducted as it is on the sound and admirable principle of making the subject of the biography speak for herself. There is no historical personage about whom more untruths have been circulated ; and, after all that has been said and written, the only way to know her is to read her correspondence.

Lord Macaulay speaks of Françoise de Maintenon in terms so pointed, that they well deserve to be quoted at the outset.

It would be hard to name any woman who, with so little romance in her temper, has had so much in her life. Her early years had been passed in poverty and obscurity. Her first husband had supported himself by writing burlesques, farces, and poems. When she attracted the notice of her sovereign, she could no longer boast of youth or beauty ; but she possessed in an extraordinary degree those more lasting charms, which men of sense, whose passions age has tamed, and whose life is a life of business and care, prize most highly in a female companion. Her character was such as has well been compared to that soft green on which the eye, wearied by warm tints and glaring lights, reposes with pleasure. A just understanding ; an inexhaustible yet never redundant flow of rational, gentle, and sprightly conversation ; a temper of which the serenity was never for a moment ruffled ; a tact which surpassed the tact of her sex as much as the tact of her sex surpasses the tact of ours ; such were the qualities which made the widow of a buffoon first the confidential friend, and then the spouse, of the proudest and most powerful of European kings. It was said that Louis had been with difficulty prevented by the arguments and vehement entreaties of Louvois from declaring her Queen of France.*

The romance of her life began with her birth, which took place on the 27th of November, 1635,† in the prison of Niort, where her father was confined. His life had been full of adventure and crime, and he was unworthy of the faithful and

* History of England, chap. XI., 1689.

† Bonhomme, p. 235.

affectionate wife who shared his imprisonment. He changed his religious profession several times, but at the moment of Frances's birth he called himself Protestant. The child accordingly was baptized in the Calvinist church of Niort, though her mother was a Catholic, and was placed under the charge of her aunt, Madame de Vilette, at Murçay, about a league from the prison. The prisoner, Constant d'Aubigné, was at length released, and being disinherited by his father for his ill conduct, embarked a second time for America about the year 1643, * taking with him his wife and children. Little Frances suffered so much from the voyage, that at one time she was thought to be dead, and a sailor held her in his arms, ready to sink her in a watery grave. "*On ne revient pas,*" as the Bishop of Metz said long after to Madame de Maintenon, "*de si loin pour peu de chose.*" †

Notwithstanding her father's evil example, there was enough in Frances d'Aubigné's ancestral remembrances to have dazzled her imagination in after-life. Her aunt, who had been her earliest instructress, was a zealous Protestant; and her grandfather, Agrippa d'Aubigné, as a soldier, a historian, and a satirical poet, was one of the first men of his day. He had served Henry IV. in various capacities, and was used to address his royal master so freely as to reproach him for his change of religion. One day, when the king was showing a courtier his lip pierced by an assassin's knife, D'Aubigné said, "Sire, you have as yet renounced God only with your lips, and He has pierced them; if you renounce Him in heart, He will pierce your heart also."

Frances's father died in Martinique, having lost all he had gained by gambling. Madame d'Aubigné therefore returned to France, and devoted herself to the education of her child. She made her familiar with Plutarch's Lives, and exercised her in composition. She would gladly have kept the task of instruction to herself, but poverty constrained her at last to resign Frances with many fears into the hands of her aunt, Madame de Vilette. The effect of this transfer was her becoming imbued with Calvinist tenets; and when, through the interference of the Government, ‡ she was removed from Madame de Vilette's care, and made over to a Catholic relative, she proved very refractory, and persisted in turning her back to the altar during Mass. Various means of persuasion were tried in vain; and it was not till the Ursuline sisters in

* Bonhomme, p. 236.

† "One does not return from so far but for a great object."

‡ Duc de Noailles, tome i., p. 77.

Paris took her in hand that her scruples vanished, and she consented to abjure her errors and to believe anything except that her Aunt Vilette would be damned. In after-life she used often to say that her mother and several of the nuns had been very injudicious and severe with her, and that, but for *the kindness and good sense of one lady in the convent*, she should probably never have embraced the Catholic faith.

Only a few years passed before she had to choose between a conventual life and a distasteful marriage. Her mother was dead, and "the beautiful Indian," as she was called, was left almost without resources. She had become acquainted with the comic poet Scarron, and often visited him. He was five-and-twenty years older than herself, and hideously deformed. A singular paralysis, caused by quack medicines, had deprived him of the use of his limbs, his hands and mouth only being left free. His satirical pieces had been very popular, and, though fixed to his chair, he received a great deal of company, and joked incessantly. He was much struck by Frances d'Aubigné, and appreciated her talents the more highly because mental culture was rapidly advancing, and the conversation in drawing-rooms began to be rational. His offer of marriage was accepted by her, for "she preferred," as she said, "marrying him to marrying a convent." In the summer of 1652 she became his bride. Such a union deserved a place in one of his own farces, and gave little promise of happiness or virtue. But the consequences were far different from what might have been expected. A change for the better had taken place in public morals, and Madame Scarron had no sooner a house of her own than she took a prominent part in the movement. She carefully tended her helpless spouse; brushed the flies from his nose when he could not use his fingers, and administered to him the opiate draught without which he could not sleep. She received his guests with a dignity beyond her years, and her conduct was regulated on a plan of general reserve. No one dared address her in words of double signification; and one of the young men of fashion who frequented the house declared, that he would sooner think of venturing on any familiarity with the Queen than with Madame Scarron. People saw that she was in earnest. During Lent, she would eat a herring at the lower end of the table, and retire before the rest. So young and attractive, in a capital of brilliant dissipation, and with such a husband as Scarron, her example could not but have an effect. Meanwhile she cultivated her mind, and learned Italian, Spanish, and Latin. She knew not what might be required of her, for Scarron's fortune was dwindling away, and he had been compelled to resign the

prebend of Mans. He was a lay-ecclesiastic, and like many literary men of that day, bore the title of Abbé. Poverty again stared her in the face, and the servant who waited at table had often to whisper, "Madame, no roast again to-day!" Devoted to her husband's sick chamber, she avoided society abroad, and wrote, only two years after her marriage, letters which might have come from an aged saint on the brink of eternity. "All below is vanity," she said, "and vexation of spirit. Throw yourself into the arms of God; one wearies of all but Him, who never wearies of those who love Him."

Her enemies have strongly contested her virtue at this period, and appealed to her intimacy with Ninon de Lenclos in proof of their allegations. This modern Leontium certainly frequented Scarron's drawing-room and also (such were the dissolute manners of the age) that of most other celebrities in Paris. But the unhappy woman herself has left behind her an unquestionable testimony to Madame Scarron's purity. "In her youth," she says, "she was virtuous through weakness of mind: I tried to cure her of it, but she feared God too much." She had, of course, many admirers, and she must needs have gone out of the world not to have them. But to be admired and courted is one thing, to yield and sin mortally is another. It might be wished that Madame Scarron's name had never been mixed up with that of Ninon, to whom virtue was "*faiblesse d'esprit*," but the freedom of her conduct must not be tried too severely by the stricter laws of propriety which prevail among us now. She never forgot Ninon, corresponded with her at times, aided her when she was in distress, and was consoled by her dying like a Christian at the age of 90.* She who had boasted that Epicurus was her model gave the closing years of her life to God.†

Madame Scarron's resistance to the importunities of Villarsceaux was well known, and is thus alluded to by Bois-Robert in verses addressed to the Marquis himself:—

Si c'est cette rare beauté
Qui tient ton esprit enchaîné,
Marquis, j'ai raison de te plaindre;
Car son humeur est fort à craindre:
Elle a presque autant de fierté
Qu'elle a de grâce et de beauté. ‡

* In 1705.

† Duc de Noailles, tome I. p. 206.

‡ "Marquis, if it is this rare beauty who holds you in chains, I have reason to pity you; for she is of a temper much to be feared. She has almost as much pride as she has grace and beauty."

But those who follow the course of Madame de Maintenon's interior life know perfectly well how to interpret what Bois-Robert called "haughtiness," and Ninon "weakness of mind." It is a matter of no small importance to rescue such characters from the foul grasp of calumny. Gilles Boileau was the only one of her contemporaries while she was young who dared to throw out any suspicion against her honour, but this he did evidently to avenge himself on Scarron, against whom he had a mortal pique.

A new era was dawning on France. Richelieu and Mazarin had by their policy prepared the triumphs of monarchy; Turenne and Condé had displayed their genius in war; the great ministers and captains waited for the moment when their master should call them to his service; and arts and letters were ready to embellish all with their rich colouring. Louis XIV. really mounted the throne in 1660, and the glory and greatness of France rose with him. Pascal, Molière, La Fontaine, and Boileau, published their works almost at the same time. Racine presented to the king the first fruits of his master mind, and the voice of Bossuet had already been heard from the pulpit. Scarron foresaw the brilliancy of the epoch, but he saw also that his own end was nigh. "I shall have," he said, "no cause for regret in dying, except that I have no fortune to leave my wife, who deserves more than I can tell, and for whom I have every reason in the world to be thankful." Humorous to the last, he made a jest of his sufferings, and, when seized with violent hiccough, said if he could only get over it, he would write a good satire upon it. He died perfectly himself, and was not even for a moment untrue to his character. A few seconds before his end, seeing those around him in tears, he said, "You weep, my children; Ah! I shall never make you cry as much as I have made you laugh." He had but one serious interval to give to death—that in which Madame Scarron caused him to fulfil his religious duties. He had always been a Christian, and neither in his writings nor in his conversation had allowed anything prejudicial to religion to escape him. A chaplain came every Sunday to say Mass at his house. "I leave you no fortune," he said to his wife when dying, "and virtue will bring none: nevertheless be always virtuous." The point of this admonition must be gathered from the corruption of the times. Her mother's last words also had sunk deep into Frances's memory, for she had warned her "to hope everything from God, and to fear everything from man." Scarron died in 1660, and was soon forgotten. His name would now scarcely be known, nor would any at this day be conversant with his

comedies and satires, but for the exalted position which his widow subsequently attained. His immediate successors obeyed unconsciously the epitaph which he had himself composed, and made no noise over the grave where poor Scarron took his "first night's rest."

Passants, ne faites pas de bruit,
De crainte que je ne m'éveille ;
Car voilà la première nuit
Que le pauvre Scarron sommeille.*

Was there ever a more pathetic joke ?

When Mazarin died in 1661, the young king summoned his council and said, "Gentlemen, I have hitherto allowed the affairs of state to be conducted by the late Cardinal ; henceforward I intend to govern myself, and you will aid me with your advice when I ask it." From that day, the face of society in France rapidly changed. Then, as Voltaire says, the revolution in arts, intellect, and morals which had been preparing for half a century took effect, and at the court of Louis XIV. were formed that refinement of manners and those social principles which have since extended through Europe. The example long set by the Hôtel de Rambouillet in Paris was followed by many others, and numerous *salons* which have since become matter of history united all that was most brilliant in genius and talent, with much that was estimable for worth and even piety.

The first ten years of Madame Scarron's widowhood were passed in the midst of these elegant and intellectual circles. The assemblies of Madame de Sévigné, Madame de Coulanges, Louvois's cousin, and Madame de Lafayette, the novelist, were, with the Hôtels of Albret and Richelieu, those which she principally frequented. She was in great distress, and her friends tried to obtain for her the pension her husband had once enjoyed. But Cardinal Mazarin was inflexible. He remembered the "Mazarinade," in which Scarron had satirized him, and refused to grant any relief to his charming widow. But she would be beholden to none for a subsistence. She retired into the convent of the Hospitalers, where a relation lent her an apartment, and lived for some time on a pittance she had hoarded. The queen-mother then became interested in her behalf, and a pension of £50 a year was assigned her. "Henceforward," she said in a letter to Madame d'Albret, "I shall be able to labour for my salvation in peace. I have

* "Poor Scarron his first night of sleep enjoys :
Hush, passers-by, nor wake him with your noise !"

made a promise to God that I will give one-fourth of my pension to the poor." She now removed to the Ursuline convent, where she lived simply and modestly, but visited constantly, and received, as the sisters complained, "a furious deal of company." Her dress was elegant, but of cheap materials, and she managed by rare economy to keep a maid, pay her wages, and have a little over at the end of the year. She might have accepted the Maréchal d'Albret's offer of a home in her hôtel, but she preferred entire independence in her own humble asylum. Many a page could we fill with accounts of the friendships she formed at this period. To epitomize her life is in one respect a painful task, for the records we possess respecting her are equally interesting and copious. She has found at last a biographer worthy of her, and it is to the Duc de Noailles's volumes we must refer those who long for further details than our space allows us to give. He is the ablest champion of her honour that has yet appeared, and refutes triumphantly the calumnies of the Duc de Saint Simon by which so many have been deceived.

At the Hôtel d'Albret Madame Scarron often met Madame de Montespan, who soon after became the mistress of Louis. The two ladies had many tastes in common, and an intimacy sprang up between them. How strangely they became related to each other afterwards we shall presently see. Meanwhile Madame Scarron was overtaken by another reverse. The queen-mother died in 1666, and with her the pension ceased. Many splendid mansions were eager to receive and entertain her, but she declined them all as permanent abodes. A rich and dissolute old man proposed to marry her, and her friends unwisely seconded his overtures; but she was proof against them, and wrote to Ninon to express her gratitude, because the voice of that licentious woman alone was raised in approval of her conduct. She was indignant at the comparison her friends made between the unworthy aspirant and her late husband, and avowed her readiness to endure any hardships rather than sacrifice her liberty, and entangle herself in an engagement which conscience could not approve. Constrained, therefore, by want, she was about to expatriate herself, and follow in the train of the Duchesse de Nemours, who was affianced to the King of Portugal. It was a sore trial, for none are more attached to their country, none endure exile with less fortitude, than the French. She saw Madame de Montespan once more; it was in the royal palace, and that incident changed her destiny. The future rivals met under conditions how different from those which were one day to exist! Madame de Montespan,

though not yet the king's mistress, was already in high favour, and the patroness of that poor widow who was afterwards, by winning Louis's esteem, to supplant her in his affections, and become, all but in name, Queen of France. Through her mediation the forfeited pension was restored, and we find her name in the list of ladies invited to a court fête in 1688. Nevertheless, her troubles withdrew her very much from the world, and she thought for a time of adopting a religious habit. Indeed it is not impossible that she might actually have done so, had she not been made averse to the step by the severity of her confessor, the Abbé Gobelin. With a view of mortifying her ambition to please and be admired, he recommended her to dress still more plainly, and be silent in company. She obeyed, and became so disagreeable to herself and others that she sometimes felt inclined to renounce her habits of devotion.* She retired, however, to a small lodging in the Rue des Tournelles, lived more alone, and, as she wrote to Ninon, "read nothing but the Book of Job and the Maxims."

Here fortune came to her relief. The infidelities of Louis XIV. are unhappily too well known. Suffice it in this place to say that Madame de Montespan bore him a daughter in 1669, and a son, afterwards the Duke du Maine, in 1670. Circumstances required that the existence of these children should be concealed, and their mother, in whose heart the voice of conscience was never stifled, bethought her of the good Madame Scarron as one who was well fitted to take charge of their education. Accordingly, she was sounded on the subject. The king's name was not mentioned, but she was informed that the secret regarding the children was to be kept inviolate. She hesitated, refused, reconsidered the matter, and at last consented on condition that the king himself should command her services. The office was far from dishonourable in the eyes of the world. Madame Colbert, the minister's wife, had been entrusted with two of his Majesty's children by Madame de la Vallière. It was not on this point that Madame Scarron was anxious, but she feared lest she should give scandal and entangle her conscience by a seeming indulgence to such immorality. Louis at last requested that she would be as a mother to his babes. They were placed with a nurse in an obscure little house outside the walls of Paris. Madame Scarron was to live as before in her own lodgings, but without losing sight of the infants. It was a point of honour with her to observe

* Duc de Noailles, tome i. pp. 310-12.

the utmost secrecy. She visited each of them separately, for they were kept apart, and passed in and out disguised as a poor woman, and carrying linen or meat in a basket. Returning home on foot, she entered by a private door, dressed, and drove to the Hôtel d'Albret or Richelieu to lull suspicion asleep. When the secret was at length known, she caused herself to be bled lest she should blush.* In two years' time the number of children had increased, and a different arrangement was adopted. A large house was purchased in the country, not far from Vaugirard, and Madame Scarron, now enjoying a certain degree of opulence, established herself there, and gave all her time to the task of education. She was lost to the world, and her friends deeply lamented her disappearance. But she was sowing the seed of her future greatness. The king, who had a great love for his children, often saw her when he visited them: the aversion he had felt for her at first gradually melted away; he admired her tender and maternal care of his offspring, contrasted it with the comparative indifference of their own mother, greatly increased her pension, and, having legitimized the Duc du Maine, the Count de Vexin, and Mademoiselle de Nantes in 1673, soon after appointed them with their *gouvernante* a place at court. Thus, step by step, without her own seeking, she was led on to exercise a higher and most salutary influence on the king's moral character, till, in reward of her long-tried virtue, she was ultimately to fix his wandering affections and effect his conversion; an object which for so many years she had regarded as the end of her being. She was nearly forty years of age when she entered on her duties in the palace; and, in that difficult and trying position, she set the glorious example of one who was guided in all things by principle, and who thought that the highest talents were best devoted to leading an irreproachable life. She had a work before her, and it was great. She contributed to withdraw the king from his disorderly habits, to restore him to the queen, and to bring about a reformation of morals in a quarter where it had been most wantonly retarded by the royal example. The king, in that day, was all in all. The ideal of the government was royalty. The Fronde had died away, and with it the power of the nobles. That of the people, in the sense in which it is now generally understood, was unknown: even infidels and scoffers scarcely dreamed of it. The monarch, like *Cyrus*† and the *Cæsars*, believed himself something more than man. Diseases fled at his touch, and he virtually set himself

* Deuxième Entretien à Saint-Cyr.

† Herodotus, *Clio*, cciv.

above all laws, human and divine. It needed the eloquence of a Bossuet to convince Louis that a priest had done his duty in refusing absolution to the mother of his illegitimate children.* The success of his arms enhanced his self-esteem, and the atmosphere of his court was so tainted with corruption that Madame Scarron often sighed for retirement, and resolved to flee from so perilous and painful a promotion. Her intercourse with Madame de Montespan was chequered with stormy dissensions, and the jealousy of the latter became almost insupportable. The education of the children was a constant subject of contention, and Madame Scarron, who knew that they would be ruined if left to their mother, was not disposed to yield any of her rights. But the Duc du Maine was the idol of his father and mother, and this served to attach them both to the incomparable *gouvernante* who loved the boy with an affection truly maternal.

Being disgusted with the court, and having received from the king a present of 200,000 francs, she bought in 1674 the estate of Maintenon, about thirty miles from Versailles, with the intention of retiring thither. But a rupture between the king and his favourite mistress was at hand, and on this circumstance hinged Madame Scarron's future career.

In spite of his profligacy, Louis XIV. was at bottom religiously disposed. His serious attention to business proved him to be a man of thought and reflection, and, when the great festivals came round, it grieved him not to be in a condition to fulfil his religious duties. The sermons of Bourdaloue during the Lent of 1675 touched him, and the expostulations of Bossuet in private deepened their effect. He resolved to dismiss Madame de Montespan, and departed to join the army without seeing her. "I have satisfied you, father," he said to Bourdaloue: "Madame de Montespan is at Clagny." "Yes, sire," replied the preacher; "but God would be better satisfied if Clagny were seventy leagues from Versailles." Meanwhile Madame Scarron, with the Duc du Maine, went to Barèges, and, as the king had, before creating her a marchioness, graciously called her, in presence of his nobles, Madame de Maintenon, we shall henceforward speak of her by the name which she bears in history. The three most important personages in our drama were now separated. The king, at the head of his army, received the letters of Bossuet, conjuring him to persevere in his promises of amendment, while Madame de Montespan, in her retreat, was pressed by the same fervid eloquence to return to the path of virtue.

* Duc de Noailles, tome i. p. 346.

But the Duc du Maine was everywhere entertained as the king's son, and fêtes that vied with each other in splendour awaited him and his gouvernante everywhere. So popular was the king, so loyal his people, that his vice passed for virtue or innocent gallantry.

Barèges was not then what it has now become. A few thatched cottages and one house with a slated roof were all it could boast. Madame de Maintenon and her sick charge, the little duke, had but one room, meanly furnished, where he slept by her side. The place was then scarcely known; but the physician Fagon had discovered it during his excursions among the Pyrenees, and, by making Madame de Maintenon acquainted with the efficacy of its baths, he raised it to importance and secured for himself fortune and renown. Here she received many letters from the king in attestation of his friendship; and returning hence, she visited Niort and the prison where she was born, the aunt she had so tenderly loved, and the Ursuline convent where she had first been schooled and supported by charity. Attentions were lavished on her in every quarter, and many valuable records of her family fell into her hands. Among these was the life of her illustrious grandfather, Agrippa d'Aubigné, written by himself.

Her reception by the king was more cordial than ever; but the high favour in which she stood did not break her resolution to renounce a court life as soon as circumstances should permit. She corresponded regularly with the Abbé Gobelin, and often expressed her willingness to follow implicitly his advice. Madame de Montespan regained her ascendancy, at least in appearance; but many thought that the king was fast becoming weaned from her, through the new influence. Madame de Maintenon exerted daily a more manifest empire. Everything, as Madame de Sévigné wrote in 1676, yielded to her. One attendant held the pommade before her on bended knee, another brought her gloves, and a third lulled her to sleep. She saluted no one; but those who knew her believed that she laughed in her heart at these formalities. "I desire more than ever," she said to M. Gobelin, "to be away from this place; and I am more and more confirmed in my opinion that I cannot serve God here." Madame de Montespan, during some years, continued to be the recognized favourite; but the beautiful Fontanges divided with her the unenviable distinction till, having just been made a duchess, she died in the flower of her youth. But amidst all his levity, Louis paid the severe Madame de Maintenon the most delicate attentions, which failed not to excite the utmost indignation in the breast

of the royal mistress. At length, in 1680, the Dauphin espoused the daughter of the Elector of Bavaria, and Louis, anxious to retain Madame de Maintenon in the service of the court, made her Lady of the Bed-chamber to the Dauphiness. In this honourable office she was set free from the bondage she had endured. She had now nothing in common with Madame de Montespan; and she exchanged the apartments she had occupied for others immediately over those of the king, where he could visit her at will and, by her lively and flowing conversation, refresh his mind when weary with business, or jaded with pleasures that had long since begun to pall. Surrounded by minions of every sort, it was something new to him to be addressed freely and without any selfish view. This was the secret of Madame de Maintenon's power over his heart, and he confessed the potency of the spell. Madame de Montespan was visited less and less, and Louis passed hours every day in the apartments of the Dauphiness, where he found also her Lady of the Bed-chamber. A cabal was formed by the deserted mistresses and some profligate ministers against the new and truly estimable object of Louis's favour; but their machinations failed. The sovereign at last broke his chains, and Madame de Montespan, like Ninon and La Vallière, made profit of the time which was allowed to her for repentance, but which had been denied to Fontanges. The miserable deathbed of that young creature, distracted by remorse, but still clinging passionately to her unlawful love, deeply affected the king,* and is said to have powerfully contributed to reclaim him from his evil habits. The benign influence of Madame de Maintenon reunited him to the long-abandoned queen, who, with all her exalted piety and Christian virtue, was deficient, it must be confessed, in tact and discernment, as well as in those intellectual gifts which would have made her an acceptable companion to Louis; while her strict devotional practices and retiring habits—habits which her native modesty and timidity of character, combined with her husband's neglect, tended to confirm—may have had no small share in increasing his estrangement. His evenings were now frequently spent with her; and every member of the royal family was delighted with the happy change, and grateful to her by whom it had been brought about. The king himself found the paths of virtue to be those of peace, and the finer parts of his character were displayed to advantage. He had naturally a kind and feeling heart, and was by

* Gabourd, *Histoire de France*, tome xiv. p. 453, Note.

no means that monster of selfishness and formality which historians so often make him.*

After the peace of Nimeguen, Louis XIV., having seen his enterprises everywhere crowned with victory, became intoxicated with his own greatness, and arrogant towards foreign powers. But the counsels of Madame de Maintenon tended to restrain his ambition and modify the defiant tone of his government. She well knew that such an attitude, besides being wrong in itself, was the certain forerunner of formidable coalitions. However lightly she might have thought of the Prince of Orange, if singly matched with the greatest potentate of Europe, she wisely judged his talents and prowess capable of inflicting great injury on France, if he were in union with exasperated allies. While her hand thus nearly touched the helm of State, it was busy as ever in dispensing private charities; and it was about this time also that she founded an establishment at Rueil which was the origin of "Saint-Cyr." "For the first time," she said, in a letter to her brother,† "I am happy."

In 1683 the queen died, and Louis, who had become convinced of her merits too late, wept over her when expiring and said, "It is the first trouble she has ever caused me." Madame de Maintenon, who had staid with her to the last, was about to retire, when the Duc de la Rochefoucauld, taking her by the arm, drew her towards the king, saying, "It is no time, madame, to leave him: he needs you in his present condition." Her position at court was now very embarrassing. She was aware of the king's predilections, and he was no less persuaded that she could be attached to him by none but virtuous ties. The Dauphiness requested her to accept the place of Lady of Honour, but she steadily refused. Was it indeed that she aspired higher? Could she fancy for one moment that Louis would exalt her to the rank of his wife? An anecdote related by Madame de Caylus would lead us to suppose that the thought had crossed her mind, and that the king himself had perhaps given her some pledge of his intentions. Madame de Caylus was astonished at her declining a post of such high dignity. "Would you," asked her aunt, "rather be the niece of a Lady of Honour, or the niece of one who refused to be such?" Madame de Caylus replied that she should look upon her who refused as immeasurably higher than her who accepted; on which Madame de Maintenon kissed her. She had given the right answer. Madame de Montespan was still at court with her children, but her day was gone by; and she

* Duc de Noailles, tome ii. p. 28.

† 20th February, 1682.

whose silent influence had wrought her overthrow never triumphed over her, and even deemed it prudent to abstain from any overt attempt to prevent the king's seeing her.

The decorations at Versailles were at this time conducted on such a scale as to make that spot one of the wonders of the world. All Europe was curious to see its gardens or read of their matchless splendour. Its fountains and cascades were never to be silent, night or day, and the waters of the Eure were to supply them by means of a canal and aqueduct more than fourteen leagues in length. Twenty-two thousand men worked on the line, which traversed the estate and valley of Maintenon. The aqueduct was there supported by magnificent arcades, and its entire cost, without counting purchase of land, was about nine millions of francs. To the town of Maintenon the "very powerful and pious" lady who bore its name was a great benefactress. She obtained for it fairs and markets, and founded in it a hospital and schools. She rebuilt, entirely at her own cost, the church and presbytery, as well as those of two adjoining parishes. She brought thither Normans and Flemings to teach the villagers how to weave, and distributed abundant alms to the poor and infirm. The king staid at her château repeatedly, and inspected the works that were rapidly advancing among the hills. Racine also was her guest about this period, and was charmed with his visit. Here too, in the very house where Charles X. and, with him, the direct Bourbon line, afterwards ceased to reign, was probably fixed that remarkable marriage of which we shall have much to record.

Madame de Maintenon was still beautiful, though in her fiftieth year. She was three years older than the king, and the influence she exerted over him was no matter of surprise to those who were used to watch her radiant eyes and face beaming with animation and intelligence. Severe virtue gave additional dignity to her distinguished and graceful manners, and while she yielded to none in conversational powers, she was also a good listener. The proud king found in her one to whom he could bow without humiliation, and her conquest of his heart was a signal triumph of moral worth. The marriage was private, and the secrecy so well preserved that its date cannot be ascertained. It is supposed to have taken place in 1685, and was celebrated by the Archbishop of Paris, in the presence of Père la Chaise; Bontemps, a valet-de-chambre, who served the Mass; and M. de Montchevreuil, Madame de Maintenon's intimate friend. A union satisfactory to her conscience was all she required, and this being obtained, she took the utmost pains to prevent the matter

becoming public. The court remained for some time in ignorance of the marriage; but the fact is beyond all doubt, and is dwelt on with little disguise by the Bishop of Chartres, in letters to the king and his wife, and by Bourdaloue in his private instructions to the latter. While Saint-Simon denounces it as "so profound a humiliation for the proudest of kings that posterity will never credit it," Voltaire, with more good sense, maintains that Louis in this marriage in no degree compromised his dignity, and that the court, never having any certainty on the subject, respected the king's choice without treating Madame de Maintenon as queen.* There is not the slightest proof that Louis ever contemplated sharing his throne with her openly, and still less that her ambition extended so far. In the passage we quoted from Macaulay the reader will have observed that he introduces the fable with "It was said." He is, in fact, there following Saint-Simon and the Abbé de Choisy,† whose Memoirs are, in this particular, altogether at variance with Madame de Maintenon's character as revealed in her letters, with the modesty and reserve which distinguished her in so high a station, and with the impenetrable silence she always observed with regard to the fact of the king being her husband.‡

Though living in the midst of the court, her elevation was, as Voltaire says, nothing but a retreat. She restricted her society to a small number of female friends, and devoted herself almost exclusively to the king. No distinction marked her in public, except that she occupied in chapel a gilded tribune made for the queen. Louis spoke of her as *Madame*, and, if the Abbé de Choisy may be trusted, Bontemps, the valet, addressed her in private as "Your Majesty." She was seldom seen in the reception-halls, but the king passed all the time that was not occupied with public affairs, in her apartment. He rose at eight, surrounded by his officers; as soon as dressed, he was closeted with his ministers, with whom he remained till midday; at half-past twelve he heard Mass, and in passing and repassing through the grand gallery, to which the public was admitted, might be addressed by any one who asked permission of the captain of his guards. After Mass, he visited Madame de Montespan daily till the year 1691,§ and staid with her till dinner was announced. This was ordinarily about half-past one. Madame de Maintenon, though she supped in her own room, dined always at the

* Siècle de Louis XIV., tome ii.

† Duc de Noailles, tome ii. pp. 131-2.

‡ Livre vii.

§ Ibid. p. 147, Note.

king's table, sitting opposite him. Then followed shooting in the park, which was his favourite amusement. Sometimes he hunted the stag, the wolf, or the wild-boar; but from the time he dislocated his arm in 1683, through his horse's stumbling over a rabbit-burrow, he seldom went to the chase mounted, but in a calash, which he drove himself, with some ladies, and very often Madame de Maintenon. Banquets were spread in the woods, and in the summer evenings gondolas with music plied on the canal, and Madame de Maintenon's place was always in that of the king. At six or seven he returned home, and worked or amused himself till ten, the hour for supper; after which he passed an hour with his children, lawful and legitimized, his brother sitting in an arm-chair like himself, the Dauphin and the other princes standing, and the princesses on tabourets. During winter at Versailles, a ball, a comedy, or an *appartement* followed every evening in regular succession. The *appartement* was an assembly of the entire court, and sometimes ended with dancing after music, chess, billiards, and all sorts of games.

There was nothing in Madame de Maintenon's temper opposed to the ceaseless festivities of Versailles, Marly, and Fontainebleau. She heightened them, indeed, by the nobler pleasures of the mind, which her influence could not fail to introduce. Her style of dress was exquisite, and elderly beyond what her age required; and while she treated all around her with the utmost attention, she was altogether free from airs of importance. She rose between six and seven, went straight to Mass, and communicated three or four times a week. While she was dressing, one of her attendants read the New Testament or the "Imitation of Jesus Christ;" and during the rest of the day her movements were regulated by those of the king. Whenever she was at liberty, she passed her mornings at Saint-Cyr, and Louis came to her regularly several hours before supper. She never went to him except when he was ill. Her income amounted to nearly four thousand pounds a year of our money; and of this the larger part was given to the poor. In vain the members of her family looked to her for promotion, in vain they reproached her with forgetting the claims of kindred: "I refer you, madam," she wrote to the Princesse des Ursins, "to the valley of Josaphat to see whether I have been a bad kinswoman. I may be deceived, but I believe I have done as I ought, and that God has not placed me where I am to persecute him continually for whom I wish to procure that repose which he does not enjoy. No, madam, it is only in the vale of Josaphat that the reasons for my conduct towards my relatives

will be apparent. Meanwhile, I conjure you not to condemn me."*

The poor and unfortunate had no cause for similar complaints. She gave away between two and three thousand pounds a year. During the scarcity of 1694, having parted with all she had, she sold a beautiful ring and a pair of horses, to supply the wants of the sufferers. "Distribute my alms," she wrote to her steward, "as quickly as you can. Spare no pains, and repine at no difficulty. Circumstances require unusual charities. See if peas, beans, milk, and barley-meal, if anything, in short, will supply the place of the bread which is so dear. Do in my house as you would in your own family. I leave it in your charge. Incite the people to courage and to labour. If they do not sow, they will reap nothing next year."

She often visited the needy, and relieved their wants with her own hand. She would put off buying anything for herself to the last moment, and then say, "There, I have taken that from the poor." Her charity inspired others with the spirit of self-denial, and the king and his chief almoner often dispensed their bounty through her. But neither poor nor rich diverted her attention from Louis. To his ease, his tastes, his sentiments—even when they shocked her—his time, and his very friendships, she sacrificed everything. He was her vocation; and her own friends could not, as she said, but look upon her as dead to them. To her the king confided all; and thus the cares of state, the perils of war, the intrigues of the court, cabals, petitions, private interests, and even family disputes, were continually rolling their din at her feet. Princes, princesses, ministers, and a crowd of persons anxious to secure their own interests, forced themselves upon her, and broke up all the pleasures of solitude and society, of study, meditation, and correspondence, for which she pined. But she had counted the cost, and bore with equanimity the absence of that perfect happiness which she never expected to attain on earth. The honours which encircled her were brilliant fetters, and galled her no less because they glittered. "I can hold out no longer," she said one day to her brother, Count d'Aubigné; "I would that I were dead!" The sense of duty was her abiding strength, and she derived consolation from reflecting that her elevation was not of her own seeking. The path by which she had been led was strange—so strange that she could not but believe she had a divine mission to accomplish. It was easy to interpret her conduct in a worldly

* Letter of 16th February, 1710.

and ambitious sense; but when, since the Master of the house was called Beelzebub, have the children of His household been rightly understood? Whatever is in the heart comes out sooner or later in the writings, and those who read *Madame de Maintenon* in her letters, will be in no doubt as to what were her guiding principles. Always true to herself, she was an enigma to those only who had not the key to her true character.

The year of her marriage was signalized by one of the most important legislative acts in the history of modern Europe. This was the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, by which, eighty-seven years before, Henry IV. had, shortly after his abjuration of Protestantism, terminated a long civil war by granting to the Calvinists freedom of religious worship and admission to offices of State. The edict itself was as contrary to the spirit of that age as it would be consonant with the ideas of this. Those who regarded each other respectively as idolaters and heretics had not yet learned to live together in social and political brotherhood. The Popes and saintly doctors of those times looked on such fraternity with horror, and foresaw that, if it became general, indifference and widespread infidelity would be its certain results. Events have justified their anticipations; and though it may be doubted whether this or that act of intolerance, such as the revocation of the edict in question by Louis XIV., were wise and expedient under the circumstances, it ought never to be forgotten that the establishment and maintenance of Catholic unity in a kingdom redounds, abstractedly considered, to the glory of a Christian prince. To this glory, the government of Louis aspired; and while it is clear from *Madame de Maintenon's* correspondence, that she took no active part in the matter, it is evident also that she approved it, as did the nation in general. Voltaire concurs with the Duc de Noailles in exonerating her from the charge of having instigated the revocation and applauded its results. No traces of a spirit of persecution can be discovered in her character. Nothing can exceed the sweetness of disposition with which she reproved her brother, when Governor of Cognac, for having treated the Calvinists with needless severity. "Have pity," she wrote, "on persons more unfortunate than culpable. They hold the errors we once held ourselves, and from which violence never withdrew us. Do not disquiet them: such men must be allured by gentleness and love; Jesus Christ has set us the example."* *Ruvigny*, a Protestant, afterwards made Earl of Galway by

* Lettre à M. d'Aubigné, 1682.

William III., spoke of her to the king as one who had a leaning to the Reformed religion; and though nothing could be more untrue, it shows that her zeal as a Catholic could not have been intemperate. The king himself told her that her tenderness towards the Huguenots came, he thought, of her having formerly been one of them; and the historians of the French refugees in Brandenburg, Erman and Reclam, allow that she never advised the violent measures that were used, and declare that she abhorred the persecutions consequent on the revocation. The authors of them, they add, concealed them from her as far as possible, knowing that she desired the adoption of no other means but instruction and kindness.* In her conversations with the sisters at Saint-Cyr, her language was always in conformity with these statements. The king, she told them, who had a wonderful zeal for religion, pressed her to dismiss some Huguenots from her service, or oblige them to enter the fold of the Church. "I pray you, Sire," she replied, "to let me be mistress of my own domestics, and manage them in my own way." Accordingly, she never pressed them to renounce their errors. She showed them the more excellent way whenever she had an opportunity, and in good time had the satisfaction of seeing them all embrace the Catholic faith.

If, then, Madame de Maintenon applauded the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, she must not be held responsible for the forced conversions, the dragonades, imprisonments, and emigration in which it issued. Her approval must be interpreted in the same sense as the Brief addressed to Louis by Innocent XI.,† in which the Pontiff congratulated him on "revoking all the ordinances issued in favour of heretics throughout his kingdom, and providing, by very sage edicts, for the propagation of the orthodox faith." The immunities granted to the Calvinists by Henry IV. involved, according to Ranke, a Protestant historian, "a degree of independence which seems hardly compatible with the idea of a State."‡ Religious dissent naturally engendered political disaffection. The Protestant assemblies in the time of Louis XIII. endeavoured to establish a kind of federal republic. Six times during that king's reign, the Calvinists took up arms. Richelieu maintained that nothing great could be undertaken so long as the Huguenots had a footing in the kingdom. They formed a treaty with Spain, with a view to their independence, and were regarded by the nation at large as a public enemy.

* Tome i. p. 77.

† 13th November, 1685.

‡ Lives of the Popes, vol. ii. p. 439.

Zealously as Madame de Maintenon laboured for the conversion of her own relatives—particularly M. de Villette and his children—it is no wonder that she concurred with the king, the clergy, and the people in thinking that the time was come to withdraw from the Protestants of France privileges dangerous to religion and to the State, and to concert more effective measures for their conversion. She held with Bossuet that a Christian prince “ought to use his authority for the destruction of false religions in his realm, and that he is at liberty to employ rigorous measures, but that gentleness is to be preferred.”* She believed with Fénelon, that the religious toleration which is necessary in one country may be dangerous in another—for the mild and loving prelate of Cambrai agreed at bottom with the sterner Bossuet on this subject.† Whether subsequent events vindicated the political expediency of the revocation; whether the evils it produced were not greater than the good it proposed; whether those who recommended it would not, if furnished with our experience, have wished it had never been carried into effect;—are questions of great importance and interest, but foreign to the purpose of this paper.

We have more than once alluded to Saint-Cyr, and it is time now to give some account of the origin and nature of that noble institution, which perished with the monarchy and old aristocracy of France, on which it depended, and of which it was a support. Like most other great works, its beginnings were small. Before Madame de Maintenon was raised so near the throne, she used often to meet at the Château de Montchevreuil, an Ursuline sister, named Madame de Brinon, whose convent had been ruined. Devoted to the work of education, this lady spent her days in giving instruction to some children in the village. Her resources being very low, Madame de Maintenon entrusted her with the care of several children whom she charitably maintained, and often visited them and their mistress, first at Rueil, and afterwards at Noisy, where the king placed a château at her disposal, and enabled her to enlarge the establishment. The daughters of poor gentlemen were then admitted to the school. The king, returning from the chase one day, paid them an unexpected visit, and was so pleased with all he saw, that Madame de Maintenon had little difficulty in inducing him to extend his royal patronage much further, and provide means whereby two hundred and fifty young ladies, of noble birth and poor fortunes, might be

* Politique tirée de l'Écriture Sainte, livre vii.

† Essai sur le Gouvernement civil, tome xxii.

instructed, clothed, and fed, from the age of seven or twelve years to twenty. The domain of Saint-Cyr was purchased; and twelve young persons belonging to the establishment, and destined for the most part to a religious life, were selected as mistresses to direct the larger institution. They entered on their duties after a noviciate of nine months, and were called *Dames de Saint Louis*. Their vows were simple, had reference to the purpose in hand, and were not binding for life. The young ladies were nominated by the king, and were required to prove their poverty and four degrees of nobility on the father's side. The final transfer of the revenues of the Abbey of St. Denis to the establishment of Saint-Cyr was not approved by the Holy See till after some years, in consequence of the disputes existing between Louis and the Court of Rome. In 1689, however, Alexander VIII. formally authorized the foundation, and in the February of the next year addressed a suitable brief to Madame de Maintenon, expressing the warm interest he felt in her undertaking. Madame de Brinon was elected superior for life, but, as she did not altogether second the designs of the foundress, relaxed the rules, and introduced amusements which were thought too worldly, a change became necessary. It was not without much patience on the part of Madame de Maintenon that the difficulties were at last overcome. Madame de Montchevreuil, their mutual friend, was charged with a *lettre de cachet* by which the king commanded Madame de Brinon to quit Saint-Cyr. She retired to the Abbey of Maubisson, of which the Princess Louisa of Hanover was abbess, and there passed the remainder of her days in honourable retirement, and in the enjoyment of a small pension. She was fond of great personages, and of playing an important part, and this feeling led to her becoming the intermediary between Leibnitz and Bossuet, in a correspondence which aimed at the reunion of Catholics and Protestants, and which, as might have been expected, produced no results.

After Madame de Brinon's departure, Madame de Maintenon devoted herself more and more to her important enterprise. As the young ladies were educated for home and the world, not the cloister, they were indulged occasionally with dramatic representations. This gave rise to two of Racine's finest pieces. Having been requested by Madame de Maintenon to invent some moral or historical poem in dialogue, from which love should be excluded, he produced "*Esther*," which was first acted at Saint-Cyr in 1689, in presence of the king. His Majesty was charmed; the prince wept. Racine had never written anything finer, or more touching. *Esther's* prayer to Assuerus transported the audience. Madame de

Sévigé lamented that a little girl personated that great king. Numerous representations followed, and crowds of eager spectators, courtiers, ecclesiastics, literati, and religious, sat beside the ex-king and queen of England, to hear the pure and harmonious verses of Racine recited by the young, the innocent, and the beautiful, to the richest and softest music Moreau could compose. This success was but the forerunner of a still greater. At the request of Louis, Racine wrote another tragedy the following year—viz., "*Athalie*;" in the opinion of French critics, the most perfect of all tragedies. But the excitement attending the play of "*Esther*" had been too great to allow of a renewal of the experiment. The "comedy," as it was called, of "*Athalie*" was performed therefore by "the blue class," without stage or costume, in presence only of the king, Madame de Maintenon, James II., and six or seven other persons, among whom was Fénelon.

In the midst of such amusements, pride and frivolity crept into Saint-Cyr, and Madame de Maintenon became convinced that she had allowed its pupils more freedom than they could enjoy without abuse. Reform was indispensable. The *Dames de Saint Louis* took monastic vows under the rule of S. Augustine. No effort was spared to inculcate piety and make religion loved. Bossuet and Fénelon were frequently invited to address the young people. One of the sermons thus delivered is found in the works of Bossuet, but the original manuscript is said to be in the handwriting of the Archbishop of Cambray. It bears, in fact, the impress of their twofold genius, but the pathos of its style stamps it as more peculiarly the production of Fénelon.*

The Duc de Saint-Simon, incapable of mastering ideas of a religious order, carps and jeers at Madame de Maintenon as one who thought herself an "universal abbess." Those who carefully examine the annals of Saint-Cyr, and weigh the difficulties that arose from the various characters of the Superiors chosen, the tendency at one time to relax and at another to overstrain the religious education of the pupils, will arrive at the conclusion that few ladies in an exalted position, and in the midst of all that is most worldly, ever possessed so much of that wise and loving spirit of government which should distinguish an abbess, as the wife, friend, companion, and counsellor of Louis XIV. One might almost say that Saint-Cyr was the passion of her life. When at Versailles she went there daily, and often arrived at six in the

* Duc de Noailles, tome iii. p. 140.

morning. The young ladies, scarcely yet awake, had the joy of seeing her beloved and revered figure among them in the sleeping apartments; and she frequently helped to dress the little ones and comb their hair, with unaffected and maternal kindness. The unremitting attention she gave to the establishment was soon rewarded, and its beneficial effects on society were placed beyond all doubt. The pupils and mistresses alike of Saint-Cyr were held in great esteem, and many of them, scattered through the kingdom, filled important educational and conventual posts; while in Hungary, Austria, Russia, and the Milanese, institutions were formed on its model. By interesting the king in its details, and inducing him to visit it very often, Madame de Maintenon partly secured the other great aim of her existence, namely, his amusement.

Of all the errors that have, from time to time, insinuated themselves into the minds of Catholics, none has worn a more plausible and poetic aspect than Quietism. It crept into Saint-Cyr under the auspices of Madame de la Maisonfort, a person of a peculiarly imaginative and mystic temperament. She discoursed with like fluency with Racine and Fénelon, and always appeared brimful of intelligence and devotional feelings. Madame de Maintenon had received her as a friend, and hailed with delight her resolution to adopt a religious habit and become one of the *Dames de Saint Louis*. She made her profession in 1692, and by moderating her vivacity for a time deceived others, and perhaps herself also. Errors akin to those of Molinos were then spreading fast, and Madame Guyon, their chief propagandist, happened to be a relation of Madame de la Maisonfort. When the former lady was arrested for the first time in 1688, her kinswoman and Madame de Maintenon interceded for her. After this she often visited Saint-Cyr, and gradually became intimate with the ladies engaged in the institution. Her manuscripts were eagerly read, and a chosen few who were first initiated in their mysteries inoculated others with the subtle poison, until all the novices, one confessor, the lay-sisters, and many under instruction, abandoning themselves, as they believed, to the sole guidance of the Holy Spirit, practised all kinds of mystic devotion, talked incessantly the pious jargon of Quietism, looked down upon those who could not embrace the new tenets, and strangely forgot their vows of obedience to superiors. Nothing was heard but the praises of pure love, holy indifference, inactive contemplation, passive prayer, and that entire abandonment of oneself to God which exempts us from caring about anything, and even from being anxious

about our own salvation.* Fénelon, by his intimacy with Madame Guyon, whose director he was, lent life and vigour to these extravagant ideas. His elevation to the see of Cambrai in 1695 was regarded by them as the triumph of their cause, and Saint-Cyr bade fair to rival Port-Royal as a stronghold of suspected tenets. But episcopal authority interfered at last, and through the remonstrances of the Bishop of Chartres, Madame Guyon was dismissed, and her books were forbidden. She continued, however, to correspond with the inmates of Saint-Cyr; and when, in December, 1695, she was imprisoned anew, they exhorted each other to remain firm and endure the coming persecution. Bossuet himself, at the request of Madame de Maintenon, now fully alive to the danger, came to assist in extinguishing the nascent error, while Fénelon, on the contrary, defended his own and Madame Guyon's opinions from what he considered to be exaggerated charges, and wrote his famous "*Maximes des Saints*" in opposition to Bossuet's "*Etats d'Oraison*." It is a question whether Bossuet was not led, in the zeal of his antagonism, to make indefensible statements of a different tendency. Fénelon, in fact, charged him with so doing; and the spirit displayed by the Bishop of Meaux in defending himself and prosecuting the condemnation of his former friend, does not present the most pleasing incident in the great Bossuet's career. Perhaps Fénelon has won more glory by his ready and humble submission to the ultimate decision of the Holy See than has Bossuet by his zeal in procuring a just censure on Fénelon's errors. The temper and ability with which Fénelon pleaded his cause began to enlist public opinion in his favour. He utterly disclaimed all participation in the errors of Quietism, and said he could easily have calmed the heated minds of the sisters of Saint-Cyr, and have brought them in all docility under their bishop's yoke.† But Bossuet invoked the authority of the king, the decision of his brother prelates, and the judgment of the Holy See. The Bishop of Chartres, on making a personal inquiry into the state of things, required that not only Madame Guyon's writings, but those of Fénelon himself, should be delivered into his hands. Whatever the merits of the question in other respects, and whatever opinion may be formed of the respective teaching of these two great men, there can be no doubt that the "*Maximes des Saints*" had fostered prevailing errors. The king expressed great

* Madame Guyon herself disowned many of the monstrous conclusions of the Quietists, while her own opinions were in excess of those of Fénelon.

† Duc de Noailles, tome iii. p. 241.

displeasure at the course events had taken, and by a *lettre de cachet* in 1698 ordered Madame de la Maisonfort and another lady to quit the establishment, and all other infected persons to be removed. They passed the night in tears in the Superior's apartment; and the next day Madame de Maintenon came to console the community for their loss. If she erred at all throughout this perplexing affair, it was by over-indulgence and by forbearing too long. When her duty became clear and imperative, she was never undecided, nor showed any inclination to encourage novelties in religion.

A history of Madame de Maintenon, however detailed, must always be wanting in those personal traits which distinguish most striking biographies, and this for the simple reason that her habits and disposition were retiring, and her daily effort was to throw a veil over herself. That her influence in the long run was enhanced by this modesty no one can doubt; yet it is not on that account the less true, that in the scenes through which she passed it is difficult to seize and depict her individually. We must, nevertheless, endeavour to give some idea of her relations with the royal family, by some of whom she was beloved, by others hated, and by all held in high consideration. Monsieur, the king's brother, liked and respected her for Louis's sake, to whom he was sincerely attached; but it was far otherwise with Madame. A Bavarian by birth, she was completely German in her tastes, and in the midst of Parisian splendour sighed for her home beyond the Rhine. She was, she said, a hermit in a crowd, and passed her days in utter loneliness. She was a Protestant at heart, intensely masculine, and had little sympathy with Madame de Maintenon's quiet mode of life. So fond was she of the chase, that she continued to follow it, though she had been thrown from her horse six-and-twenty times. Madame de Maintenon was her special aversion, and this antipathy arose principally from her national prejudice against unequal marriages. The king's wife was, in her view, an upstart, and the credit she had obtained at court did not diminish this impression. She spoke with contempt of her piety as mere hypocrisy, and laid to her charge every species of enormity. She had pandered to the Dauphin's profligacy; killed the Dauphiness by means of her accoucheur; led the young Duchess of Bourgogne into sin; monopolized corn during a famine to enrich herself; and never dreamed of anything but her own pleasures and ambition: she had poisoned Louvois and, nobody knew why, the architect Mansart; she, with Père la Chaise, had instigated the persecution of the Protestants; she had set fire to the Château of Lunéville; and,

from her retreat at Saint-Cyr, fomented conspiracies against the Regent! Truly the poison of asps was under the lips of Madame Elizabeth of Bavaria. The Dauphiness, on the other hand, neglected by her dissolute husband, made Madame de Maintenon her friend, and found consolation in pouring her troubles into her ear, and listening in return to her sage and tender counsels. After ten years of sickness and sorrow in her married life, she died of consumption in 1690. "See," said the king to her unworthy partner, "what the grandeur of this world comes to! This is what awaits you and me. God grant us the grace to die as holily as she has done!"

The pages of French history present few pictures more replete with grandeur and interest than the retreat of the great Condé at Chantilly. Crowned with the laurels of a hundred victories, the princely veteran there gathered around him a more distinguished staff than had ever sat in his councils of war—men who, endued with intellectual might and moral greatness, were to achieve lasting conquests in the realm of mind. Profoundly skilled himself in history, philosophy, art, science, and even theology, he loved to entertain those who, in various ways, had devoted their lives to the triumph of knowledge and reflection over ignorance and sensuality. All that was noblest in birth and cultivated in mind met together in his orangeries, and sauntered among his gardens and fountains. There the most eminent prelates of their time were seen side by side with the greatest dramatists, historians, and poets. There was Fléchier and Fleury; there La Fontaine, Boileau, and Molière; there Rapin and Huet, La Bruyère, and Bossuet. There wit sparkled and wisdom shone as incessantly as the jets and cascades that rose and fell in light and music by night and day. Thither came often the entire court, and with it Madame de Maintenon, a star among stars, brilliant but retiring, to enhance the glory of the illustrious and aged chief. There, honoured by the king and closeted with him daily, as at Versailles and elsewhere, she could not fail to receive the willing homage of every member of the house of Condé. There, too, after the general's death, she saw her former pupil, the king's daughter, Mademoiselle de Nantes, espoused to Condé's grandson; and thus, as time went on, she watched the career of those whom she had educated, and who formed the more noble alliances because the king had raised them to the rank of royal princesses. Never did any lady occupy a more remarkable, and in some respects, a more enviable position than herself. "There never was a case like it," says Madame de Sévigné, "and there never will be such a one again." She united the most opposite con-

ditions. By her union with Louis she was all but queen, and by her admirable tact exerted over state affairs a far greater influence than belongs in general to a sovereign's consort. She had been the servant of that very king of whom she was now the helpmate; a wise instructress to his children, and a mother in her affection and care. At one moment she was acting abbess, controlling the complicated irregularities which had crept into the religious and secular economy of Saint-Cyr, and at another she was mediating as peacemaker in the family quarrels and petty jealousies of pampered courtiers, or by her sage counsels arresting the ravages of war, and rescuing harmless populations from the scourge of fire and sword. Children loved to hear her voice, and hung upon her smiles; the poor and afflicted were fain to touch the hem of her garment, for they felt that virtue went forth from her; none were so great as to look down upon her; none so lowly as to think that she despised them. Her sovereignty over others was that to which men render the most willing obedience—the sovereignty, not merely of station or intellect, but of character, of sterling worth, of wisdom learned in the school of suffering, of virtue tried like gold in the fire.

As Madame de Maintenon's talents and merits prevented her being lost in a crowd of courtiers, or in any way identified with them, so, on the other hand, her affectionate disposition kept her from being isolated and closing herself round against any intrusion of private friendship. So far from it, she had with her a select group of ladies who were called her familiars, who shared with her, in a measure, the king's intimacy, accompanied her in her walks and drives at Marly, and were her guests at the dinners and suppers she gave at Versailles and Trianon. They were in some sort her ladies of honour, though, like herself, without any visible distinction. Of these the principal were Madame de Montchevreuil and Madame d'Heudicourt, both old friends, and with them nine others, among whom were her two nieces, Mesdames de Mailly and de Caylus. To each of these a history attaches; for the constant companions of so extraordinary a woman could not but have special attractions and remarkable qualities. There were in this number those who had drunk deeply of the intoxicating cup of worldly pleasure, and having drained its poisonous dregs, thirsted for the fountain of living waters: It was Madame de Maintenon's especial care to encourage such friends in their heavenly aspirations, and lead them, in the midst of the court, to enter the devotional life. Often she called the fervent Fénelon to her assistance, and his letters addressed to Madame de Grammont are a lasting proof of the

readiness with which he answered to the call. If, as all her contemporaries assure us, it was impossible to combine more that was pleasing and solid in conversation than did Madame de Maintenon—if, in her case, Reason, as Fénelon expressed it, spoke by the lips of the Graces—how admirable must she have appeared when she directed her powers of persuasion to the highest and most blessed of all ends! Neither pen nor pencil can adequately recall the charms which surrounded her; but the captive heart of Louis and the unanimous voice of the richest and most lettered court in Europe attest their reality and power. In her ceaseless efforts to amuse the king, his immortal interests were never lost sight of; and if she spoke to him comparatively seldom on the subject, it was because it occupied all her thoughts. Out of the abundance of the heart the lips are often mute.

In 1686 Louis suffered extreme pain and incurred great danger from a tumour, which at last required an operation. This circumstance brought Madame de Maintenon's capacity for nursing into full play. It was she who watched by his bedside, and alleviated the sufferings of the nation's idol. The surgery of that day was wretched, and the operation for fistula which had to be performed was attended with great danger. Intense solicitude prevailed through the country; for, in spite of all efforts to prevent anxiety, the report spread rapidly that the king's life was in peril. The churches were thronged, and the people's attachment found vent in prayer. The royal patient alone was unmoved. The *grande opération*, as it was called, had been decided on six weeks previously, and the evening before it was to take place he walked in his gardens as usual, and then slept soundly through the night, as if nothing were to happen. On waking he commended himself to God, and submitted to the painful operation with the utmost coolness. Louvois held his hand, and Madame de Maintenon was in the room. In the afternoon he sent for his ministers, and continued to hold councils daily, though the surgeon's knife cruelly renewed the incisions several times. "It is in God," wrote Madame de Maintenon, "that we must place our trust; for men know not what they say, nor what they do." The fourteen physicians of Charles II. were still more unskilful in his last illness,* and justify equally the opinion of the Northern Farmer:—

* "The king was in a chair—they had placed a hot iron on his head, and they held his teeth open by force."—Agnes Strickland's "Lives of the Queens of England," vol. viii. p. 447.

"A loathsome volatile salt, extracted from human skulls, was forced into his mouth."—Macaulay's "History of England," chap. iv., 1685.

Doctors, they knaws nowt, for a says what's nawways true :
Naw soort a' koind o' use to saây the things that a do.

In the case of Louis, however, the operator Félix answered to his name. A cure was effected, and the kingdom was filled with demonstrations of joy. "Every one," as Madame de Maintenon wrote, "was in raptures. Father Bourdaloue preached a most beautiful sermon. Towards the close he addressed the king. He spoke to him of his health, his love for his people, and the fears of his court. He caused many tears to be shed ; he shed them himself. It was his heart that spoke, and he touched all hearts. You know well what I mean." After dining with the citizens of Paris at the Hôtel de Ville, Louis drove through every quarter amid the loudest acclamations. "The king," wrote his wife again, "has never been in such a good humour as since he has witnessed the enthusiastic love the capital bears towards him. I very much like his sentiments : perhaps they will inspire him with the design of relieving his people." Absolute as the sovereignty of Louis was, his subjects delighted in his rule. He was the last of a long line who, century after century, had formed the nation out of the confusion of feudal times, and had, of all kings, the best right to say, if indeed he ever did say,* "*L'état, c'est moi !*" In him the State was summed up, and the kingdom was impersonated in him. The soldier expiring on the battle-field cried "*Vive le roi !*" and vessels have gone down at sea with the entire crew shouting the same words ; for "*Vive le roi !*" was, in their minds, equivalent to "*Vive la France !*" The government of Louis XIV., though despotic, was, on the whole, marked by moderation, particularly after the death of Louvois ; and if sometimes, seduced by the glory of foreign conquests and the love of regal display, he forgot the interests of his people, and the misery his magnificence entailed on them, Madame de Maintenon was always near to counteract the arrogant minister, urge counsels of peace, and heal the bleeding wounds of a loyal population. Yet she was far from being a meddling politician. Her advice was not offered, but asked. She abstained from entering into details, and confined herself to general suggestions of a moral character, dictated by conscience, not ambition. If she guided, or, rather, gently disposed the king to this or that measure, she was in turn guided herself. Her correspondence with the Abbé Gobelin, Fénelon, and the Bishop of Chartres sufficiently proves that her highest ambition was to be a servant

* See Duc de Noailles, tome iii. p. 668.

of God. That Racine, of whom she was the friend and patroness, should extol her in his verse* is not surprising; but the satirist Boileau, be it remembered, was no less her eulogist. If Byron's beautiful lines on Kirke White had the more weight because they occurred in his most biting satire, something of the same kind may be said of Boileau's testimony to Madame de Maintenon:—

J'en sais une, chérie et du monde et de Dieu ;
Humble dans les grandeurs, sage dans la fortune :
Qui gémit comme Esther de sa gloire importune ;
Que le vice lui-même est contraint d'estimer,
Et que, sur ce tableau, d'abord tu sais nommer.†

The Duc de Noailles is not the only member of the French Academy who has arisen of late years to refute the calumnies of Saint-Simon. M. Saint-Marc Girardin has ably defended the victim of his malignity in the *Journal des Débats*,‡ and Messieurs Rigault, De Pontmartin, Monty, Chasles, and Hocquet, have pursued successfully the same generous and equitable course.

When James II., in December, 1688, fled from his kingdom, the sympathies of more than half the French people were enlisted on his side. Ignorant of the British constitution, they knew little of the peril it had incurred through the king's extraordinary extension of the dispensing power, and they saw in the landing and success of the Prince of Orange nothing but a horrible domestic tragedy, in which, through personal ambition and hatred of the true religion, a Catholic sovereign was hurled from his throne by an unnatural daughter and son-in-law. They joined, therefore, without any misgiving, in the cordial reception given to the royal fugitives by Louis, and desired nothing so much as to make common cause with them, and take vengeance on their foes. Madame de Maintenon was not among those who pressed with all ceremony into the presence of the exiled king and queen; but she visited them in private, and was received as became her station. The compassion she felt for their fate, her respectful address and Christian consolations, so won upon Mary Beatrice, that a lasting friendship was formed between the queen in name, not in reality, and the queen in reality, not in name. It continued

* "Esther," act ii., scene vii.

† "I know one beloved of God and man, who is humble in her grandeur and wise in her good fortune; who groans like Esther over her trying glory; whom Vice itself is compelled to respect; and whom, on seeing this picture, you will name in an instant."—Satire X.

‡ 4th and 16th October, 1856.

without interruption during five-and-twenty years, and was cemented by unity of sentiments and mutual services. The ex-queen had married in her fifteenth year, and had overcome, by the advice of her mother and of the Pope, her desire to devote herself to a religious life.* Whatever may have been her trials in a convent, they could hardly have equalled those which befell her as queen. A hundred and forty-five of her letters to Madame de Maintenon are extant, and the readers of Miss Strickland's "Lives" are familiar with the Chaillot correspondence, in which the desolate and sorrowful queen pours forth the fulness of her sensitive heart, and never tires of expressing her love and esteem for that remarkable friend whom Providence has led across her thorny path. Often Madame de Maintenon repaired to Saint-Germain to visit her, and still more frequently the latter came to Versailles to see Madame de Maintenon. It was some relief to escape for a time from that downcast, dreary court in exile, where a crowd of poor but faithful followers gathered around a master equally wrong-headed and unfortunate. The semblance of royalty which was there kept up only increased the sadness of the place, and fostered those jealousies, intrigues, and cabals, of which a banished court is so often the parent and victim.

A powerful coalition, in the creation of which the Prince of Orange was the chief agent, had long been menacing France, and was now actually formed. Louis found himself opposed to the greater part of Europe, for the Emperor Leopold, the Germanic and Batavian federations, the kings of Spain and Sweden, and the Pope himself, obliged to act on the defensive, adhered to the league of Augsburg.† Three powerful armies were sent by the king of France to the seat of war. The mission of one of them was to capture Philipsburg; and from the camp before that stronghold the king's brother wrote many letters to Madame de Maintenon, describing the operations in progress. The Duc du Maine also, once her pupil, and now in his eighteenth year, wrote to her from time to time, and received thankfully the advice she offered him with all a mother's solicitude. The second of the three armies was charged with the devastation of the Palatinate, and fulfilled the part assigned it with distressing precision. If its soil was not to supply the French, it must furnish nought to the Germans. It was a perfect garden, and Duras received orders to reduce it to a wilderness. Half a million of human beings were warned that in three days their houses would be burned and their fields laid waste. Fiercely the flames went up from

* Duc de Noailles, tome iv. p. 231.

† Ibid., p. 253.

city and hamlet, and the fugitives sank with fatigue and hunger in the snow, or, escaping beyond the borders, filled the towns of Europe with squalid beggary. Every orchard was hewn down, every vine and almond-tree was destroyed. The castle of the Elector Palatine was a heap of ruins; the stones of Manheim were hurled into the Rhine. The cathedral of Spires and the marble sepulchres of eight Cæsars were no more; and the fair city of Trèves was doomed to the same cruel fate. It was time for the voice of mercy to speak. Marshal Duras had already written to Louvois,* to remonstrate against the barbarous orders he was compelled to execute, and Madame de Maintenon herself is said to have interceded with Louis for the suffering people of the Rhine. The Duc de Noailles, indeed, does not state this, like Macaulay,† as matter of history, though he allows that it is probably true; and this variety in the views of the two historians, each anxious to do justice in this particular to the king's wife, proves how difficult it is for even the most sagacious and unprejudiced writers to arrive at the exact truth in reference to bygone days. Macaulay is certainly inclined to attribute to Madame de Maintenon a much larger measure of political power than she really exercised; and it is curious to observe the chain of pure assumptions by which, having taken it for granted that she "governed" Louis, he arrives at the conclusion that she induced him to recognize the Pretender as James III.‡ In a letter written § soon after the taking of Philipsburg, she seems to disclaim all active interference in State affairs. In speaking of Louvois, she says, that she never contradicted him, and adds, "People think that I govern the kingdom, and they do not know that I am convinced God has bestowed on me so many favours only that I may seek more earnestly the king's salvation. I pray God daily to enlighten and sanctify him." But it is evident how completely an earnest recommendation to Louis to spare Trèves, and stay the ravages in the Palatinate, may have tallied with that unique and hallowed purpose. Have not those from whom such truculent orders emanate, a terrible account to render? Has not she who dissuades a ruler from an iniquitous measure done something towards saving his soul?

There are stories afloat respecting Madame de Maintenon, and in everybody's mouth, which the Duc de Noailles scarcely

* 21st May, 1689.

† Hist., chap. xxv., 1701.

‡ Hist., chap. xi., 1689.

§ 4th October, 1688.

condescends to notice. That she who always spoke and wrote of Louis in terms of affectionate homage should have seriously committed herself to such assertions, as that her daily task ever since her marriage was to amuse a king who could not be amused, and that he was so selfish that he never loved anything but himself, is an improbability as inconsistent with her character and policy as it is at variance with the facts of the case. That in his latter years her life was embittered by his fretful and querulous temper, and by the fits of passion into which he often fell, and that in one of her letters written at that period, she complains of the difficulty of amusing him, is undoubtedly true; but this and similar complaints ought not to be stretched beyond their natural meaning, and made to tell too severely against the king. When, in the early part of 1691, Louis appeared in the camp before Mons, his wife, separated from him for the first time since their marriage, retired to Saint-Cyr, alarmed at the dangers he was about to incur, and unable to conceal her sadness. Consolatory letters poured in upon her from all quarters, especially from her spiritual friends and advisers—the Abbé Gobelin, the Bishop of Chartres, and Fénelon. But “the selfish monarch who could not be amused,” did he, amid the bustle of a siege, find time to write to a lady fifty-five years old, whose only business had been to amuse him or fail in the attempt? He did; and that not once now and then; not briefly and dryly, as a matter of form; not like a man who had little to say, and still less attachment, to the person to whom he said it. No; every day in her solitude, Madame de Maintenon was consoled by seeing a royal dragoon ride into the court-yard with a letter for her from his Majesty, and almost every day with one from the king’s brother also. Nor was this all; the king, “who had never loved any one but himself,” proved that there was at least one exception to this rule, and that he loved his wife. In 1692 she joined him at Mons, by his command, in company with other ladies of the court, and followed him to the siege of Namur. Amusements were not wanting in the royal camp. The king and his courtiers dined to the music of timbrels, trumpets, and hautboys, and he reviewed his troops in the presence of carriages full of fair faces. But, with all this, he visited the different quarters so diligently, and inspected so closely the works and trenches, riding continually within range of the enemy’s guns, that his wife had almost as much anxiety for his safety as when she pondered at a distance the cruel chances of war.

In spite of his many faults, there was much in Louis XIV. to captivate the imagination of one like Madame de Maintenon.

"No prince," says the Duke of Berwick,* "was ever so little known as this monarch. He has been represented as a man, not only cruel and false, but difficult of access. I have frequently had the honour of audiences from him, and have been very familiarly admitted to his presence; and I can affirm that his pride is only in appearance. He was born with an air of majesty, which struck every one so much, that nobody could approach him without being seized with awe and respect; but as soon as you spoke to him, he softened his countenance, and put you quite at ease. He was the most polite man in his kingdom; and his answers were accompanied by so many obliging expressions, that, if he granted your request, the obligation was doubled by the manner of conferring it; and if he refused, you could not complain."

Madame de Maintenon's campaigning life was not altogether free from disagreeables. On one occasion, writing from Dinant,† she relates how they encountered more difficulty in retiring from Namur than in approaching it. They were eleven hours and a half on the road, and wholly unprovided with food. She arrived at her journey's end exhausted with hunger, and suffering also from rheumatism and headache; but, it being an abstinence day, the only repast that awaited her was oil-soup. The king likewise, though throughout the campaign he dined ordinarily with all the sumptuousness of Versailles, found himself obliged sometimes to partake of a cold collation under a hedge, without quitting his travelling-carriage. Warfare would be an easy calling if such were its worst hardships.

In Flanders, as in France, Madame de Maintenon continued to take the most lively interest in the course of events, martial, political, and social. Proximity to the scene of action did not induce her to exceed those limits of reserve which she had long since marked out for herself. Though informed of all that happened, and forming a sound judgment on almost every occurrence, though earnestly desiring peace rather than aggrandisement, and justice rather than glory, she obtruded no views of her own in the cabinet of the king, nor even influenced the choice of generals. It was her habit of close observation, and her exact description of all that passed, which made Napoleon Bonaparte delight in reading her correspondence, and pronounce it superior to that of Madame de Sévigné, because it had more in it. Madame de Maintenon speaks in one place of her own style as "dry and succinct;" and, indeed, were it not for the piety which constantly breathes through

* *Memoirs*, vol. ii.

† 12th June, 1693.

them, her letters would often read like the despatches of a general. She is brief, terse, sententious; her mind being evidently bent on things rather than on words. As a letter-writer, she resembles Napoleon himself more than any other French authoress. Her style is free from that vacillation, that timid adoption of a definite line, which always indicates a weak thinker and a total absence of system in the mind. Had it been otherwise, she would never have stood so high in the esteem of foreign courts, nor would princes and sovereigns, such as the Elector of Cologne, the Duc de Lorraine, and his mother, Queen Eleanor, have written to ask favours at her hands.

The reign of Louis XIV. lasted so long, that neither his son nor grandson ever sat on the throne. If the latter, the Duc de Bourgogne, had not died in his thirtieth year, he might, as the once docile pupil of Fénelon and Madame de Maintenon, have fulfilled his promises of excellence, and have left to his successors a rich inheritance of wisdom. "*Telemachus*" was not composed expressly for him in vain. He was born in 1682, and at an early age was affianced to Marie-Adélaïde of Savoy. The princess was at that time only eleven years old, and was, by the marriage contract, to remove to France, and be wedded in the ensuing year. The union of the young couple was celebrated in 1697, but on account of their extreme youth they continued to live apart two years longer. During this time, Madame de Maintenon undertook to complete Marie-Adélaïde's education. The instructress was worthy of a princess destined, as it was believed, to govern France. All day she sat by her when sick, and Racine read Plutarch's "*Lives*" to her during the pauses of the night; Bossuet was her chaplain, and Dangeau, whose manuscript memoirs of Louis's court have proved so useful to historians,* was her knight of honour. She was the delight of all around, and so charmed the king, that he was never willing to part with her. But there were no apartments Marie-Adélaïde so much loved to frequent as those of Madame de Maintenon. Severe as her admonitions often were, she possessed in the highest degree the art of attaching young persons to her, and inspired them insensibly with taste, wisdom, and nobility of mind. She had long been convinced that the education of princes was conducted, generally, in such a way as to prepare them for habitual *ennui*. They learned and saw everything in childhood, and, when grown up, had nothing fresh to see or learn. She withdrew her, therefore, as far as possible from the court,

* They were first published entire in 1856.

and submitted her to the simple and wholesome routine of Saint-Cyr. The princess proved extremely docile, and her amiability was as striking as her diligence. The society of the religious in Saint-Cyr, so far from putting a constraint on her lively and winning ways, seemed only to fit her more completely to be the pet companion of Louis XIV. Her sprightly talk, her opening mind, her elegant simplicity, amused him in his walks and drives, in the gardens, the galleries, and the chase; and while he contrived daily some new diversion for the fascinating child, he could not but trace in her the happy results of Madame de Maintenon's unwearied attention. She entered into all her childish pleasures, and even played hide-and-seek with her, that she might, as she said afterwards, gain her ear for serious truths, and by yielding all she could, have the better reason for withholding what would have been hurtful. At last—nor was the time long—Marie-Adélaïde quitted Madame de Maintenon's embrace, and with her heavenly counsels graven on her memory, and given in writing into her hands, bidding farewell to the hallowed cloisters of Saint-Cyr, and to her daily gambols and prattle with the loving and indulgent king, she took her place beside her destined bridegroom, and "entered other realms of love."

Such was the woman of whom the worldly and sceptical speak jeeringly as the proud widow of Scarron; the intriguing, austere, ambitious Marquise de Maintenon; the persecutrix of Huguenots, and the despot of her royal spouse. They know not what they speak, nor whereof they affirm; for they are incapable of estimating the character of the righteous. Outward acts are to them an enigma and a stumbling-block, because the soul and its guiding principles cannot be seen. A true Christian, such as Madame de Maintenon, is an object of faith—as is the Church, and as was the Church's Lord in the days of His humiliation. Seated, to say the least, on the footstool of the throne, and surrounded by all the pomp and circumstance of royal life, she was to jaundiced eyes but one in a crowd of princes and courtiers, and differing from them only in that she was more astute; but, seen as the prelates of Cambray and Meaux saw her—seen as her letters and conversations with the nuns of Saint-Cyr exhibit her—seen as the Duc de Noailles describes her, and "Time, the beautifier of the dead," has rendered her—she was using this world and not abusing it; seeking society only to improve it, and solitude only to pray; holding all she possessed in fealty to her unseen King, and making every occupation subordinate to that of loosening her affections from earthly vanities, and fastening them wholly upon God.

The Duc de Noailles's history does not end with the fourth volume. It leaves Madame de Maintenon in her sixty-second year—two-and-twenty years before her death. To trace her intercourse with Louis during the long and disastrous war with Spain, called the War of the Succession—her counsels and influence during the defeats by Marlborough and Prince Eugene, and the triumphant reprisals of Vendôme and Villars—her grief at the king's death in 1715, when she had reached her eightieth year—her retirement to the long-loved shades of Saint-Cyr—her devotion and zeal heightening as age advanced, and the celestial goal was neared—her conversations with the sisters, and her letters to the Princesse des Ursins—to analyse her correspondence, and her *vade-mecum* as published by M. Bonhomme—to record the pillage of Saint-Cyr, and the outrage done to her venerable remains, as to those of the royal dead in S. Denis, by the frantic revolutionists of 1792—would supply ample materials for another article, but would only confirm the views already formed of her prevailing character and principles. Enough, perhaps, has been said to place our readers on their guard against the malice and fictions of the Duc de Saint-Simon and a host of detractors who rely too readily on his word, and to dispose them favourably towards a most judicious and remarkable history, which does honour to the French Academy and the illustrious house of De Noailles.

ART. V.—THE IRISH CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT.

The Church Establishment in Ireland, Past and Present. Illustrated exclusively by Protestant authorities; with Appendices showing the Revenues of the Established Church, the Religious Census of the Population of Ireland, and other returns bearing on this subject. Dublin: Warren. 1863.

IN an article on the Established Church in Ireland, in No. 102 of this Review,* we proved, from the contemporary language of Sir Robert Peel, that Catholic emancipation was granted, neither as an act of justice nor as an act of favour, but because it could not any longer, on account of the numbers and power of the Catholics in this kingdom, be safely refused; and that, to use the very words of that

* If we seem now rather to adopt than to prove some of our conclusions, we would refer the reader to that former article, where we venture to think the conclusions are fully proved.

statesman, it was "*imperatively necessary to avert from the Church, and from the interests of institutions connected with the Church, an imminent and increasing danger.*" Instead, therefore, of being a free concession, it was the unwilling sacrifice of a part of what had been unjustly withheld, in order, if possible, to make safe the unjust withholding of the remainder. The Catholics, however, did not enter into any bargain to accept part in full discharge for the whole of what was due to them. Even so far back as the days of Charles James Fox, when Catholics were told to be content with the sop which had then been thrown to them, his reply was, "I am told the Catholics have already got so much that they ought not to ask for more. My principle is directly the reverse of this. Until men obtain all they have a right to ask for, they have comparatively obtained nothing." The Catholics, as free and equal subjects of this realm, feel and say with Charles James Fox, that they have obtained comparatively nothing until they have obtained all they have a right to ask for; they feel that they are entitled to ask for all that Protestants in their situation would ask for; and they leave their Protestant fellow-subjects to think for themselves and decide in their own minds whether, if they were as numerous in a Catholic kingdom as Catholics are in this Protestant kingdom, *they* would be content to have a Catholic Established Church imposed upon them; and whether they, *if such a Church were imposed upon them, would ever rest satisfied until they had relieved themselves from the burden.* In precisely the degree in which a Protestant feels conscious how intolerable it would be for him to have, under such circumstances, a Catholic Church Establishment forced upon him, in that very degree should he recognize and sympathize with the dissatisfaction felt by Irish Catholics, and aid them by every means in his power to terminate an injustice so grievous that the world cannot furnish another like it—the Church of a minority established and maintained in the midst of a large and unwilling majority.

The question, in fact, simply is, whether Irishmen are to be admitted to an equality with Englishmen and Scotchmen. If so, the Irish Established Church cannot remain as it is. This, then, is the real question—are the Irish equal before the law with the English and the Scotch? Are they equal subjects of the Crown? Are their wishes and their interests entitled to equal attention? Are they entitled to say, "Judge Irish questions as you judge English questions and as you judge Scotch questions; give to the Irish what the Irish think to be good for themselves, just as you give to the English

what the English think to be good for themselves, and as you give to the Scotch what the Scotch think to be good for themselves?" Grant perfect equality to the Irish, and you abandon the Irish Established Church. Maintain the Irish Established Church, and you refuse perfect equality to the Irish.

All the arguments of those who plead in favour of the Established Church of Ireland resolve themselves into this—that they know what is good for the Irish better than the Irish know what is good for themselves—that the religion of the Irish is not so good as that of the Irish Established Church, and *therefore*, the latter is to be maintained and imposed upon the Irish contrary to their wishes—in other words, that the Irish are not, equally with the English and the Scotch, entitled to judge for themselves.

We repeat that there is not a single argument in favour of the maintenance of the Established Church of Ireland which does not immediately cease to have any force or application, if it be once admitted that the Irish are entitled to an equality with the English and the Scotch; that this Irish question is to be judged and determined just as a similar English or Scotch question would be judged and determined; and that the wishes of the Irish are to be consulted as to the Irish Established Church, just as the wishes of the English have been consulted as to the English Established Church, and as the wishes of the Scotch have been consulted as to the Kirk of Scotland. There is no room here for any discussion as to the purity of the Catholic religion or the quality of the Irish character. To defend the Established Church of Ireland by the assertion that the established religion is the best, is, of course, a mere begging of the question. The Irish deny that it is the best, and assert their own form of religion to be the best. Are they as fully entitled to maintain their own opinion as the English and the Scotch? Is their opinion entitled to the same respect and consideration as that of the English and the Scotch? If you think not, say so plainly, and we know on what ground the Irish Established Church thenceforward stands. If you admit it is, then there is an end of the Irish Established Church. Either treat the majority of the Irish in the same way as you treat the majority of the English and the majority of the Scotch, or declare plainly that they are not entitled to the same treatment. The English have such an Established Church as the majority of the English prefer; the Scotch have such an Established Kirk as the majority of the Scotch prefer: upon what principle, except that of power, in spite of right and reason,

can an Established Church be maintained in Ireland which the majority of the Irish do *not* prefer?

Two remarks are commonly made by those who admit the abstract force of this reasoning. 1st. That though, if the thing were to be done to-day, no one would think of establishing the Protestant Church in Ireland; yet it *is* established there, it exists and has long existed there, and therefore ought not to be disturbed. And the 2nd remark is, What would be the practical benefit to the Irish people of the removal of this alleged grievance? How would it in any way whatever improve their present position? As the *Times* puts it (14th September, 1864)—“The abolition of the Protestant Establishment may be an act of justice, or even of policy, but it is really childish to say that it would have any perceptible effect in making Ireland more happy, more industrious, or more prosperous.”

We might deny our opponents the right to enter into this question at all. When a man asks for justice, it is no reply to him to say, “What good will it do you?” He may well rejoin, “What is that to you? Do your duty by granting me what is just: whether it will do me good or not is my own affair. I think it will.” When one individual claims at the hands of another an act of justice, and is told in reply, “What you ask for may be an act of justice, but it is childish to think it would make you more happy, more industrious, or more prosperous,” the ordinary conclusion is that the person on whom the claim is made is unwilling to do the act of justice required, and seeks to evade the performance of it. And such a reply to the Irish may therefore well be regarded, and in fact is regarded, as an attempt to evade the performance of an act of justice towards them.

But we contend that the abolition of the Established Church in Ireland *would* make Ireland more happy, more industrious, and more prosperous; and there is one ready mode of bringing this conclusion home to the minds of Englishmen and Scotchmen. Would the enforced establishment to-morrow morning of the Catholic religion in England and Scotland, in spite of the feelings and convictions of the majority of Englishmen and Scotchmen, make England and Scotland less happy, less industrious, or less prosperous? What do *you* say, good Protestant reader, whether of English or Scotch birth—would you feel less happy if, when you woke to-morrow morning, you found the Catholic religion the established religion of the land—your parish church occupied by a Catholic priest, and every other parish church throughout the land similarly occupied by Catholic priests, monks, and friars; and your

tithe, and those of your Protestant neighbours, and of all other tithe-payers throughout the country, thenceforth payable to the Catholic clergy? Would you be equally happy? Assume even that the Catholic priests bore their honours meekly, did not exact their dues harshly, did not use their position and their revenues to oppose and thwart your dearest interests, did not offer any obstacle to your building chapels and schools in every parish, nor use their money and influence to entice away the children of your poor from frequenting them—assume them to be guiltless of any one of those exasperating acts with which the established clergy in Ireland have been so frequently charged, would you, my Protestant friend, think it made no difference to you that you paid the same amount of tithe money to the Catholic priest instead of the Protestant minister? If any one were quietly to assure you that the tithe was only so much additional rent, and that to you it mattered not who received it, would you listen to him with patience? Would you not either deem him a simpleton, or conclude that he deemed you to be one? Would the irritation and disquietude of mind in which such a state of things would involve you be calculated to lessen your personal comfort and happiness? Would the great majority of Protestants in England and Scotland be as happy and contented, as calmly industrious, and as comfortably prosperous, if all the churches and tithes and ecclesiastic endowments were possessed by a few Catholics, and they found all this material provision turned against them, instead of being employed, as they conceive, for their benefit—while, moreover, they had still to provide for the maintenance of their own pastors, or to be deprived of pastoral ministrations altogether? Is not this something like asking whether Protestants are human beings? And must not the remark of the *Times* be equally absurd, if the Irish are human beings?

The argument of the *Times*—that the abolition of the Protestant Establishment would have no perceptible effect in making Ireland more happy, more industrious, or more prosperous—is precisely the argument which was urged by the advocates for a continuance of negro slavery; and many even who pleaded for the emancipation of the negroes, on the ground of the injustice of depriving a man of his personal liberty, and of the oppression to which the state of slavery necessarily gave occasion, were very doubtful whether the general happiness, industry, and prosperity of the negro population would be increased by the measure. But the whole point of this argument confessedly turns, not on the ability or right of a powerful minority to judge for the majority what is

for their happiness and comfort, in opposition to their own desires, but on the supposition that the negroes are an inferior race, incapable of judging in higher matters for themselves, and for whom therefore the servile state is the only one permanently suitable; or that at present, as a race, their intellectual capacities have been so lately developed, and the habits which enable men to take their position in a social state so imperfectly formed, that the negroes are necessarily in a condition of pupillage and dependence, debarred for their own benefit, no less than the security and advantage of others, from that right of choosing for themselves which they would assuredly misuse to their own detriment.

But the negro slaves have been emancipated, and, if we mistake not, the *Times* would maintain the plea of justice on their behalf, in spite of any doubts which might exist as to the effect of liberty on the industrial habits of the slaves or their material prosperity. Be as just, then, we say, to the Irish as you were to the negroes. What reason was there for emancipating the negroes from the thralldom of slavery, which is not equally applicable—or, rather, much more so—for emancipating the Irish from the thralldom of the Established Church? The right of which they are deprived is not the same right, but it is equally a right.

Whether there still exist a single human being who would defend the Irish Established Church by reasoning analogous to that by which slavery was defended, we know not. But so completely does the establishment, in past times, of a Protestant Church on Irish ground imply, for its justification, that the subjected majority belonged to an inferior race, or had fallen into a state of degradation practically equivalent, that we are driven to the conclusion that such a notion did, in a great measure, underlie the claims advanced by the supporters of Protestant ascendancy. The dominant minority in Ireland identified with Protestantism was viewed as the superior race, intellectually and socially, and possessing, as such, some inherent right to legislate for the souls as well as bodies of the Catholic majority; who should not presume to think and act for themselves, because they were incapable of doing so to any good or useful purpose. They who would still maintain the Protestant Established Church in Ireland must rest its maintenance upon this foundation; they who feel and admit that such a foundation is absurd and irrational, must abandon all idea of maintaining the Established Church in Ireland.

But then it is urged (as we have said) that though the Protestant Established Church in Ireland is so indefensible in principle,

that we should never think of introducing such an institution there now, for the first time, yet it in fact exists, and has existed for the last 300 years, and therefore ought not to be disturbed. If it were not, then it ought not to be; but as it is, therefore it ought to continue. But might not the same argument have been advanced against every great change, every improvement, real or alleged, which has been effected during the last thirty-five years? Thus argued the borough-owners against the Reform Bill; thus argued the slave-owners against the Negro Emancipation Bill; thus argued many land-owners against the repeal of the corn laws; thus argued the old East India Company against the non-renewal of their charter; thus argued many of the ship-owners against any alteration in the navigation laws; thus argued all those who were, or thought they were, interested in things as they were, against the alterations, reforms, and improvements of which we now enjoy the beneficial results. Seeing things as they now are, the Freetrader wonders how the Protectionist could ever have argued in favour of things as they were: the blessings of free trade are so great, so obvious, and so essential to the present condition of things, that every one wonders how the country previously existed without it; the mischievous absurdities of the system of protection and exclusion are so glaring, that people who live in the present free atmosphere, cannot understand how their fathers could have subjected their minds to the absurdities and their bodies to the starvation of the old system. In a generation after the abolition of the Established Church in Ireland, it will be equally inconceivable to our sons how we and our forefathers—the majority of the Irish people—could have borne the absurd anomaly and grievous injustice of having the Church of so inconsiderable a minority imposed upon us.

But indefensible as it is in principle, the practical mischiefs of such an anomalous institution afford a yet more serious objection. In our former article on this subject, it was shown that there is not an existing prejudice or matter of complaint which either the Irish allege against the English, or which the English allege against the Irish, which is not to be traced to the Irish Established Church; that all the defects which are regarded by either race as inherent in the other, and all the faults of which either country accuses the other—all the mischiefs in which each thinks that the other has involved it, and all the deprivation of advantages which each attributes to the other—are ultimately referable to and deducible from this insane attempt to establish and maintain a Protestant Established Church in the midst of a Catholic people. Test this by

any particular instance; select any prejudice, any special supposed defect of race or fault of which either people is accused, any mischief alleged to have been sustained, or any advantage alleged to have been lost, and then proceed quietly to consider whether the fact, if the accusation be true, or the accusation itself, if unfounded, may not be traced to that habitual mode of feeling, speaking, and acting towards each other which has been engendered by a Protestant Church, established and maintained amongst a Catholic people? Is not this the constant irritant which keeps up the chronic inflammation in the body politic, and deprives mild remedies of the power to bring it into a state of sound, quiet, and steady health? Is it not this which prevents, and, as long as it continues, ever must prevent, the perfect fusion and amalgamation of the several races of people, and the universal prevalence of identical laws amongst them? Every wise statesman—indeed, every man of common sense—desires that the fusion be perfect, that the inhabitants of England, Ireland, and Scotland be as one people, that equal laws prevail in every part of this United Kingdom, and that the three be blended into one, not by the mere compulsive force of parliamentary enactment, but by a thorough union of heart and soul. But how can this be? How is it possible that it ever can be, so long as the Irish are not treated like the English and the Scotch? How can it be, so long as the English and the Scotch have each a Church established among them acceptable to the majority, whilst amongst the Irish a Church is established which is unacceptable to the majority?

Again we revert to the old question—How would you English or you Scotch feel and act if the Irish case were yours? Only believe that they feel as you would feel under similar circumstances; give them cause to feel so no longer, and you do more to fuse and amalgamate the peoples, to promote their welfare and happiness, and to increase the material and moral strength of the nation than has ever before been accomplished or even attempted. If you, our Protestant readers, to whatever race or family you may belong, could not submit in a country where you formed the large majority, to have an established religion differing from your own forced upon you, why should you expect the Irish Catholics to submit to it? If such a grievance, so persistently enforced, would prevent you from ever thoroughly and cordially amalgamating with those who thus exercised dominion over you, so long as the grievance lasted, why should not such a fact produce a similar effect in the hearts of Irish Catholics? Only treat the Irish Catholics as human beings, with a nature, heart, and feelings,

like your own; deal with them as you would have others under similar circumstances deal with you, and you will soon have the Irish heartily and thoroughly one with you. They are certainly as warm-hearted as you, they love justice and hate injustice as strongly as you can do; only be thoroughly just to them, and they will be thoroughly one with you. But no half-measures will do, no mere instalment of justice or any inequality whatsoever. If you say, or practically maintain, that there is any one act of justice to which they are not entitled equally with yourselves, because they are Irish Catholics, then you treat them as an inferior class of beings; you raise the barrier of separation between them and you; you set a distinct mark upon them; you exclude them from an equal share of the common benefits of national association; you thereby, in effect, treat them as "aliens in birth, in nation, and in religion;" you sow the seed and nourish the plant of discord within them, and how can you expect it to yield other than its natural produce? It must and will be so to the end of time. As long as you maintain the Protestant Established Church amongst the Irish Catholic people, you maintain the principle of disunion; you weaken this kingdom, and prevent its various peoples from pursuing their individual employments in the healthy vigour of quiet content, as men spontaneously exert their energies to the utmost for the mutual benefit of themselves and of their country, when they have no cause for dissatisfaction with their government. You make agitators of them—men with an abiding social grievance; you draw them from their workshops and their fields to attend public meetings and frequent political associations; you create and foster in them the habit of dissatisfaction with government, by giving them one just cause for it. A dissatisfied mind never applies itself well to anything: you lessen therefore their industry, their energy, their material welfare, and their personal happiness, even in the most quiet times; and you expose yourselves, in unquiet times, to all the possible mischiefs which spring from the just dissatisfaction of a people.

And this you do for the maintenance of an unjust principle, without any useful practical result whatever. By the unjust maintenance of your Protestant Established Church amongst the Irish Catholics, you do *not* make Protestants of them; you do not even pretend to say that the Established Church in Ireland is successful in Protestantizing Irish Catholics; whilst it is obvious that its compulsory existence amongst them creates a feeling of antipathy towards it and towards *the rule that supports it*. If you make proselytes at all, you

allege that you make them by your voluntary associations and missionary societies; and whatever results these may be said to accomplish, it is obvious that they have in the first instance to contend with and overcome the feeling adverse to Protestantism habitually engendered in the Irish mind by the odious intrusion and continued presence of a Protestant Established Church amongst them. Abolish this Protestant Established Church, and you will then at any rate have reason to believe that the missionary efforts of Protestantism will have fair play amongst Irish Catholics. But to maintain the Protestant Established Church in Ireland, which, on your own confession, exercises no missionary influence over the Catholic population, and keeps up in the Irish mind the old feeling of antipathy to Protestantism, at the same time that you are attempting to win over Irish Catholics to Protestantism by the volunteer efforts of Protestant missionaries, is really—looking at the matter from your point of view—to sacrifice the religion you profess to the material establishment which you maintain. England has tried the compulsory method for more than three hundred years in vain. The sword and the Protestant Church entered Ireland together; the Church was forced by external power upon an unwilling people; a system of penal laws, more rancorously and ingeniously cruel than was ever known in the world before, was adopted to maintain it; the prejudices of race, which might otherwise have been forgotten, were nursed and fed to serve it; landlords became tyrants in the vain wish to help it; because of it the tenants loved not their landlords; and because the law and the government sided with it, the people grew habitually to regard the law and the government as their enemy rather than their protector. Ireland was persecuted, impoverished, and embittered for the sake of the Established Church. If any one doubt this, let him reflect whether, if the whole Irish people had become Protestant, the whole course of English legislation would not have been altered the next morning. At length the miserable and dissatisfied state of Ireland became dangerous to England. Irish grievances were alleviated, not for the sake of Ireland, but for the safety of England. Even down to and including the Act of Emancipation, measures of relief were passed, not because they were just to Ireland, but because they were expedient for England.

We grant that in later years a better feeling and a more just intention has prevailed; and statesmen and governments of both parties, and the majority at least in parliament, have devised and passed various measures with a view simply to be

just to Ireland, and to promote the improvement and happiness of the Irish. The measures have not always been most wise in design or perfectly successful in result; still we believe they have been sincerely well intended, and have accomplished a certain amount of good. If disappointment has been felt that they have not, apparently, produced all the effect upon the Irish mind that was expected, let the reader reflect for a moment whether the expectation itself was a reasonable one. 1st. The traditions and feelings created by centuries of grinding oppression are not to be overcome and effaced in a single generation. "Confidence," Lord Chatham has told us, "is a plant of slow growth." But, 2ndly, does it not imply an ignorance of human nature to expect that the measures which have been passed, or any which can be proposed, will give entire satisfaction so long as the Protestant Church remains established in Ireland? We would ask our Protestant fellow-countrymen to consider how they can reasonably expect the people of Ireland to be content so long as the Church Establishment is maintained. You retain that which is unjust, and complain that it is felt to be an injustice; you wish for perfect union, and maintain the cause of disunion. For what greater cause of disunion can there be than for men to see a religion not their own established amongst them, and upheld in spite of them? Attempted interference with even so comparatively slight a thing as the *language* of a people cost Holland the loss of Belgium, and was one of the causes which alienated Schleswig-Holstein from Denmark. What ground of complaint can the majority of a people have against the ruling minority greater than that of meddling with their *religion*, and that to the extent of compelling the majority to maintain the religion of the minority? England sympathizes with the Italian people, yet what Italian sovereign ever ventured to inflict so galling a grievance on his subjects as England still inflicts on Ireland? England would not be sorry to see Venice and Lombardy escape from the rule of Austria, and Rome under another government than that of the Pope. Yet is any complaint which the Venetians and Lombards allege against Austria, or any which is put into the mouth of the Romans against the Pope—or are all the complaints which all or any of these people truly or untruly allege against their rulers—so oppressive or so intolerable as the complaint of Ireland against England—that England forces upon Ireland an Established Church which is not that of the people of Ireland? England condemns herself when she sympathizes with those who suffer under far less grievances than she herself inflicts. She not only condemns her own

greater injustice, but she displays a glaring instance of complacent self-delusion. England preaches sermons of liberality to the nations of the Continent, and is, or seems to be, blind to the fact that she has yet to practise in Ireland what she preaches abroad. The foreigners listen to the sermon courteously, but take no further notice of it, because they consider it a mere empty political parade; or, if they reply at all, they point tauntingly to Ireland. England must either abolish the Protestant Established Church in Ireland, or be silent as to lesser grievances on the Continent.

Let us for a moment consider what would in all human probability have been the present condition of Ireland, if she had been treated like England and Scotland, and no attempt had been made to force an alien Church upon her, and the Irish people had been left in the free enjoyment of their own religion. Religious animosities there would have been none; the prejudices of race would soon have died out and been forgotten; the Irish would have recognised and valued the English connection; nothing would have intervened to impede the flow of mutual goodwill, to prevent the natural fusion of the races, or to arrest the steady progress of material prosperity. Land in Ireland would now have been as well cultivated as it is in England and Scotland; and trade and manufactures would have been equally flourishing. What cause would have existed to provoke any difference of treatment? Ireland, with her beautiful and commodious bays, harbours, and rivers, with her rich soil and mild, moist climate, and her sharpwitted and able-bodied sons, who want only an adequate inducement to work as hard at home as they do in London or in Liverpool, would have yielded her full contribution to the wealth and strength of England; the inhabitants of the two islands would by this time have been conscious of little other distinction between them than exists between the natives of two different counties; the same laws would have governed all, and all would have regarded the laws with the same respect. How much misery would have been spared to Ireland; how much war, bloodshed, and debt would have been saved to England! Ireland would have been at once the sword and shield of England, instead of presenting, as she now does, its vulnerable point. And in the serene and assured sense of being without cause of complaint against each other, they would have been without jealousy or apprehension as to any external combinations; there would have been no reason to fear the placing of arms in Irish hands, for the volunteers of Ireland would have offered as ready and powerful a security to the kingdom as

those of England; energy and industry would have been developed alike throughout the United Kingdom; and however great, liberal, and prosperous this kingdom may now deem itself to be, its greatness would then have been more solid and perfect, its liberality more consistent and uniform, and its prosperity would have included every class of its subjects. If these and other such results, which we may conceive with more or less distinctness, would have ensued, and have been attained and enjoyed long ere this, had the Irish been left to the free enjoyment of their own religion, England must recollect that she lit the torch of discord, and with her it rests to extinguish it. Not only cannot the Irish be expected to be content whilst the Church of England remains established amongst them, but Irishmen would not be of the stuff to be of use to England if, under such circumstances, they were content. Englishmen might well despise them if they were content, because Englishmen know that they would not themselves be content under similar circumstances.

What, then, is to be done? Do justice to the people of Ireland, entire justice—there is no other remedy. It is the old golden rule, Do to them as you would have them do to you. Nothing less will serve. And the sooner this remedy is applied, the more effectual it will be. If you do it now, you may have credit for doing it, because it is just: delay it till some critical period arrive, and it will be attributed rather to your selfish prudence than to your sense of justice. Make an end of and leave no further room for the maxim that “England’s danger is Ireland’s opportunity.” Say rather, and with more nobility of feeling, that “Ireland’s grievance is England’s opportunity”—the opportunity to be just. Is this Church Establishment in Ireland a grievance? Is it an injustice? You admit it is—that if the thing were to do again, you would not attempt it now; but you add, there it is! A great effort is doubtless required to remedy a great injustice. Men cannot see the enormity of that to which they have been accustomed; it is very difficult to be just when the injustice has been of long standing, and the prejudices and interests of so many persons are enlisted in its favour. As a mere party move, what we propose may not seem to carry with it any very strong recommendation; it is a mere act of justice, but it is one which would have the effect of attaching to British rule millions of subjects in a manner in which they have never been attached before; and even were that not so, an act of justice ought to be recognized by a statesman as an act of the highest wisdom and policy.

We might suggest considerations tending to show that such a

measure would not be so very disastrous, or even useless, to the political party who proposed it ; but we decline to rest it on any such inferior motives. If just and right, we claim it for Ireland on that ground alone ; and we cannot hold out any prospect of the Irish people ever being satisfied without it. If any English Protestant reader should be disposed to tax the Irish on this account with want of loyalty, let him remember that the Irish have, for the last three hundred years, been loyal enough to bear what it is admitted the English and the Scotch would never have borne. Notwithstanding their many grievances, and their principal grievance of an alien Church imposed upon them, they have formed, on the average, one third of the British army ; and in fact they formed one half of that which enabled General Sir Charles Napier to gain his most splendid victory. And are the men who thus fight for their country to be told they are disloyal, because they are dissatisfied when they find in their native island a Church, which is not the Church of the majority of the people, the established Church of the land ?

But it may be contended that, having borne it so long, they will continue to bear it. This is a dangerous ground of confidence. First of all, it disregards the justice of the claim, and seems rather to consider how much of injustice may be practicable, or how long injustice may be tolerated—a system of morality which no Government would be willing to avow, though many have acted upon it. But it is always dangerous to any country that any considerable portion of its inhabitants should be, with good reason, discontented : many and various are the possible circumstances under which such a state of things may entail great disasters or ruin. But even supposing the discontent only to smoulder in the breasts of the people, it interferes with healthy action, and damages the nation at large no less than the individuals themselves. And those who by their landed possessions have the deepest stake in the country are most vitally interested in the removal of this ground of disaffection. So that the Irish landed proprietor, the inferior cultivation and inferior value of whose land is the consequence of the dissatisfaction created by the Church Establishment in Ireland, has the most stringent reasons for desiring its removal.

But besides the injury resulting to the country by this drag upon its energy, industry, and enterprise, there is another external mode in which this dissatisfaction injures the nation. Dissatisfied emigrants carry their dissatisfaction to every part of the world, and they thus sow the seeds of antipathy to England wherever they settle. England might well bear this

with indifference if they were dissatisfied without reason ; but the worst of it is, that their dissatisfaction is reasonable ; and though they may hence be disposed, after they become the subjects of another state, to regard the conduct of England through a distorted medium, and with rancorous and prejudiced feelings, yet England ought to recollect that the first fault was her own ; that she, by her own injustice, caused the Irish to leave their native shore discontented men, and prone therefore to judge her harshly and unfairly. If the fact be at this moment that the Irish element in America tends in any degree to intensify the animosity of Americans against England, any unpleasant results accruing from this antipathy may well be regarded as in some measure retributive for the wrongs heretofore inflicted by England on her Irish subjects. Apart, then, from the question of morality, no nation, however powerful, can afford to be unjust to any large number of her subjects ; and if a nation persist in such a course, the consequences are sure ultimately to develop themselves in some inconvenient and, possibly, unexpected form—nay, in many forms alike inconvenient and unexpected. And thus it happens that the injustice of the Established Church in Ireland may be one primary cause of the ill-will towards England which is said to prevail in the Northern States of America.

Let Government only deal with Ireland, an integral and not unimportant part of the United Kingdom, as it does with various distant colonies—with Australia, with Canada, with the Mauritius, even with Malta, or with India. Why should the people of Ireland be treated worse than the inhabitants of any of these colonies or possessions—worse even than Mahometans or Pagans ? When England finds the Catholic religion prevailing in a colony, or even in a conquered country, it does not impose the maintenance of a Protestant Establishment upon the Catholic inhabitants. Nay, it does not lay this burden even upon its Mahometan or Pagan subjects. Let, then, England no more think of maintaining a Protestant Church in Ireland, than she would of imposing it on a conquered country or a ceded possession at the present day. Surely our own people, they who form part of our own conquering army, are entitled to as much fair consideration as the inhabitants of a distant island which becomes ours by right of conquest or cession. The people of Ireland—a part of ourselves—ask only for the application to them of the rule adopted with respect to distant dependencies or recent acquisitions of the British empire, and not to be put upon a worse footing than the inhabitants of the Mauritius, Malta, or even India.

We have said nothing of the excessive wealth of the Irish Church Establishment, or of any other vice attaching to the system : as Gustave de Beaumont says, "Of all its vices, the most enormous is its simple existence; its extinction, as regards Ireland, would be the first step in the direction of good sense and order." How is it possible to pretend, with any appearance of decent consistency, to apply legislation based upon sound principles to a country in which an institution is upheld by the legislature the very existence of which is so utterly subversive of all sound principle? Abolish the Protestant Established Church of Ireland, and you may with strict consistency abolish any other abuse or anomaly; but retain it, and there is not an abuse or an anomaly, however grievous or absurd, which has not, by parity of reasoning, an equal right to remain untouched. Either you were wrong in abolishing the rotten boroughs, in repealing the corn laws, in regulating the navigation laws, &c., or you will be right in equally reducing the Irish Church into conformity with common sense and justice, and the manifest wants and wishes of the people of Ireland. As the author of the pamphlet we have prefixed to this article writes, "A consistent policy, falling in nothing short of equal justice, and conceding nothing to retaliation, can alone introduce social harmony into Ireland. The recollections of ancient wrongs live on, because a portion of those wrongs survive. The existing Ecclesiastical Establishment is the Past, embodied and monumental." It is itself a still enduring wrong, and on its front is engraven the record of all past wrongs. As long as this stands unaltered the Irish Catholic will never believe that England is sincere in the profession of justice to Ireland.

Those who concur in desiring the abolition of the Church Establishment in Ireland, may still consistently maintain what opinions they please as to Church establishments in general. The Irish Establishment is not (as was shown at length in our former article on the subject) capable of being supported by any theory or scheme of Church establishments which has ever been propounded. Mr. Burke exclaimed long ago, "Don't talk to me of its being a Church! It is a wholesale robbery!" Lord Brougham, in 1838, called it "an anomaly of so gross a kind that it outrages every principle of common sense. Such an establishment kept up for such a purpose, kept up by such means, and upheld by such a system, is a thing wholly peculiar to Ireland, and could be tolerated nowhere else. That such a system should go on in the 19th century—that such a thing should go on while all the arts are in a forward and onward course—while all the

sciences are progressing—while all morals and religion too—for there never was more religion and morality than is now presented in all parts of the country—that this gross abuse—the most outrageous of all—should be allowed to continue is really astonishing. It cannot be upheld unless the tide of knowledge should turn back.” Well, it is twenty-six years since these words were spoken, and this most outrageous abuse of all, which could be tolerated nowhere else, still damages the character of England, and scandalizes the world. The only thing which is more astonishing to the world is, that England, with such a monstrous and glaring internal abuse as this, should presume to open its mouth in reprobation of other abuses in other countries, which, however great they may be considered, are far less than that of the Church Establishment in Ireland.

If any one be disposed to deny the fact of discontent in Ireland, as connected with the Church Establishment, we may support our opinion by that of Earl Russell, who said, in 1844, “I believe that so long as the Church remains in its present condition, the contentment of the people never will exist.”

We conclude with two concurrent testimonies from the two present leaders of the Government and the Opposition in the House of Commons, Mr. Disraeli and Lord Palmerston. The first contains the strongest and truest expression of the condition of Ireland in reference to its Established Church, and the duty of England in reference to both, that we have ever met with. Mr. Disraeli said in 1844:—

That dense population in extreme distress inhabited an island where there was an *Established Church which was not their Church*, and a territorial aristocracy, the richest of whom lived in distant capitals. Thus they had a starving population and an *alien Church*, and, in addition, the weakest executive in the world. That was the Irish question. Well, then, what would honourable gentlemen say if they were reading of a country in that position? They would say at once—the remedy is revolution. But the Irish could not have a revolution; and why? Because Ireland was connected with another and more powerful country. Then what was the consequence? *The connection with England thus became the cause of the present state of Ireland.* If the connection with England prevented a revolution, and a revolution were the only remedy, *England logically was in the odious position of being the cause of all the misery of Ireland.* What, then, was the duty of an English minister? *To effect by his policy all those changes which a revolution would do by force.* That was the Irish question in its integrity. The moment they had a strong executive, a just administration, and *ecclesiastical equality*, they would have order in Ireland, and the improvement of the physical condition of the people would follow.

We beg a careful consideration of this summing up of Mr. Disraeli's. Historically, as well as logically, England has been the cause of all the grievances of Ireland; those grievances are in his opinion such as both to cause and to justify a revolution as their only remedy. The chief of those grievances is the Protestant Established Church; and nothing, in the opinion of Mr. Disraeli, has prevented a revolution but the mere power of England to keep Ireland in a state of grievance without redress. How exactly this confirms our previous remark that England is encouraging others to revolution for less causes than she has herself given to millions of her own subjects! Mr. Disraeli continues: "What, under these circumstances, becomes the duty of an English minister? To effect by his policy (*i.e.*, voluntarily and peacefully, but promptly) *all those changes which a revolution would do by force.*" What would be one of the first and, by universal consent, one of the most just changes consequent on a successful revolution in Ireland? Surely an abolition of the Protestant Church Establishment. It follows, then, from Mr. Disraeli's argument, that this is one of the first duties of an English minister; and we ask the leader of the Opposition to press its prompt fulfilment upon the Premier.

What says Lord Palmerston? In 1845 he thus expressed himself:—

The question which my honourable friend has brought under the consideration of the house is this—whether the funds which are required for the purposes of the Bill (for the increased grant to Maynooth) are to be taken from the Consolidated Fund, or from reductions to be made in the establishment of the Irish Church. I should prefer taking the course proposed by my honourable friend (the latter of the two courses), and on that account I shall give him my vote on this occasion. I think nobody who has heard the statements made in this debate, with regard to the present condition of the Irish Church, can for a moment doubt that, after every provision which can be required for the proper discharge of the duties of that establishment, ample funds might be found for the purposes to which my honourable friend would apply them. Well, then, sir, is parliament authorized to make that application? Why, *I think that no man who has voted for the Church Temporalities Bill can for a moment doubt or dispute that parliament has that power.* I hold that the revenues of the Church of Ireland were primarily destined for the religious instruction of the people of Ireland; and if it be shown to me that the religious instruction of that portion of the people by whom those revenues are now possessed, does not require support to the full extent to which those revenues go, I should not feel any difficulty in applying any portion that might be wanted for other purposes; not indirectly to the support of persons intended to be instructors, but directly to a use analogous

to that for which they are now employed, directly in aid of the religious instruction of the people of Ireland. In my opinion that is a question that will necessarily press itself upon this house. It is impossible, in my opinion, that the present state of things in Ireland, in regard to the two establishments of the two different sects in Ireland, can be permanent.

Lord Palmerston clearly admits the right of parliament to deal with the temporalities of the Irish Church Establishment; if it possess the right to touch them at all, it is equally clear that it must be a right which can be limited only by the judgment and discretion of parliament.* Parliament, therefore, is competent to do justice to the Irish people in this matter; and it only remains for parliament to do this act of justice promptly and fully, and for those statesmen whose opinions have been quoted in the former article and in this, to do now what they have so often said ought to be done.

ART. VI.—THE UNIVERSITY QUESTION.

Appendix to a Letter on University Education for English Catholics, suggested by an article in the "Dublin Review." By Very Rev. CANON OAKELEY. London: Burns, Lambert, & Oates.

Letter addressed to the "Tablet" of Nov. 12, 1864. By the "CATHOLIC LAYMAN."

Cui bono? University Education: A Letter to a Catholic Layman by the Rev. H. A. RAWES, M.A., Priest of the Congregation of the Oblates of S. Charles. London: Longman.

IT will be seen that rejoinders have been put forth by the two writers whom we criticised in our former article† on this subject. These rejoinders, however, are of a different character: for Canon Oakeley discusses our arguments, whereas the "Catholic Layman" does not apply himself to a continuation of the controversy, but only to an explanation of his meaning, where we had misconceived it. Meanwhile a fresh and very effective advocate of our own view has come forward in the person of F. Rawes. We will first, then, encounter Canon Oakeley on the question

* Lord Palmerston, while he admits the right, wishes to exercise it only "after every provision which can be required for the proper discharge of the duties of the Establishment." We admit the justice of the claim during the lives of the present incumbents, but to carry it a step further would involve the absurdity that the minority are to be cared for *before* the majority, and would violate every principle upon which any Church Establishment has ever been defended, in theory or in practice, at any time or in any part of the world.

† No. VI., October, 1864.

of argument ; and then the "Catholic Layman" on the question of fact : thirdly, we will give to our readers some slight taste of F. Rawes's quality.

It is with greater regret than we can express, that we find ourselves most unwillingly in a certain position of antagonism to Canon Oakeley, who, we are persuaded, is thoroughly at one with us in principle. But it is our deliberate and profound conviction, that for many years English Catholicism has not been menaced by so serious a peril as by the proposal of a Catholic College at Oxford ; and we could not, therefore, without dereliction of duty, allow any personal feeling to interfere with the freedom and straightforwardness of our expressions. Neither is it possible for us to speak (which Canon Oakeley seems to wish, p. 43) as though we thought it a question on which there is much to be said on both sides ; or on which we hold our own opinion with any kind of doubt or misgiving. Yet we sincerely hope that neither in this article nor in the former will a syllable be found, which implies the slightest disrespect for one, to whom the present writer feels himself closely bound in affection no less than in principle.

Our most satisfactory mode of treating his appendix will be to recapitulate our former reasoning, and note the points of divergence between the author and ourselves. We will start, however, rather with agreement than with difference, and express our cordial assent to his note at page 43. "The more I consider the plan," he says, "of sending young Catholics to a Protestant college, such as Christ Church or Balliol, the more do I shudder at the prospect which it opens to us."

As to his own proposal, the author reminds us that "he never defended the project with anything like enthusiasm, or, indeed, otherwise than with considerable hesitation." We represented him exactly so : he "is inclined," we said, "rather than otherwise to favour the proposal" (p. 399). The chief part of our article, however, was printed off before his pamphlet appeared, and was concerned with a writer who advocated the same measure with great confidence and heartiness.

The foundation of our argument was this : A Catholic college, like any other, would contain a few youths of great intellectual power and earnestness, and a much larger number of more ordinary character. But it is the former class which would give its entire colouring to the tone and spirit of the college ; since "the more ordinary young men, who really take an interest in the studies of the place (and, if they do not, every one would admit that they are better away), will always look up with unquestioning veneration to the unanimous

utterances of these energetic thinkers" (p. 401). "A youth of ordinary talents would follow the lead of the higher minds under whose influence he is brought; while at college, he would accept their line of opinion as authoritative; and would carry with him from college a strong conviction that these are the legitimate leaders of thought" (p. 387).

Our author makes no objection to this view, though, we think, he has failed to see, as have some other critics also, how simply it underlies our whole argument. Here, then, we shall assume its truth. It follows that if the highly intellectual few would, beyond all doubt, be liberalized and de-Catholicized in such an University as Oxford, the evil would not be confined to them, but the whole college would be corrupted by the infection. The entire question, therefore, turns absolutely and critically on this, how far the intellectual few would be proof against the evil influences of the place. We answered most confidently in the negative; and gave two principal reasons for our answer.

(1.) We argued in detail (pp. 374-384) that it would be impossible for such youths to be proof against these evil influences, unless they should not merely receive a specially Catholic instruction, but should also be practically trained to regard that instruction as the one supreme and authoritative element of all. Canon Oakeley has neither expressed nor implied difference from this opinion; and, as he speaks generally (p. 33) of differing from us on fact rather than on principle, we may conclude that he concurs with it. He seems, we say, to concur with us in thinking that unless that instruction which is specially Catholic occupies the paramount place in a student's intellect, imagination, and affections, those disastrous results must ensue at which he "shudders" no less than we do. We would entreat him, then, to consider what hope there is in securing for Catholic Truth this intellectual supremacy over an Oxford youth's whole heart and mind:—

A Catholic youth (we said) of conspicuous abilities, comes up to Oxford. He is animated by an eager desire of distinguishing himself on a larger stage than has hitherto been afforded him, and he has a profound (not to say greatly exaggerated) intellectual reverence for this world-known and time-honoured University. What ensues? His whole heart is, of course, with those studies which can gain for him University distinction, and his whole intellectual reverence is for that curriculum which the University has so long sanctioned and approved. His Catholic College may impose on him a certain course of specially Catholic instruction; but he will fret and be impatient under the infliction, and content himself with a most perfunctory obedience to the College rule. All this is really so very obvious, that it would be an insult to the common sense of our readers if we insisted on it at any length. His

specially Catholic instruction would occupy not a paramount, but, on the contrary, the very lowest place in his intellect, his imagination, and his affections—(p. 385).

Canon Oakeley quotes part of this paragraph (p. 36); and replies that the danger would, he thinks, be averted if the college superiors were "at once intellectually competent to cope with the adverse influences to which the faith of the students would be exposed, and at the same time, deeply penetrated with the *zelus animarum*, and habitually versed in the best methods of carrying that spirit into practice." For ourselves, we are unable to see how such qualifications would enable them even to diminish the evil in an appreciable degree.

There is another powerful agency which would also be at work in the same evil direction; viz., the University examinations.

F. Newman says most truly that "nothing will be found to impress and occupy the mind" of students "but such matters as they have to present to their examiners." In like manner, nothing which is prepared for a purely domestic and family examination will impress and occupy the mind even commensurably with those studies, proficiency in which will be displayed before an University audience, stamped with University approval, and rewarded by University renown—(p. 400).

Our author admits the force of this argument (p. 40), but adds that there would be a similar evil in the case of "any University education which deserves the name." On the contrary, in the examinations of a Catholic University, or higher college, that knowledge which is specially and characteristically Catholic, would receive its due pre-eminence; and every effort would be made by every authority with which the student was brought into contact to impress on his mind its unapproachable greatness and importance.

(2.) There is also a second general argument on which we laid much stress, in behalf of our proposition, that any intellectually gifted Catholic would suffer most grievous detriment to the purity of his faith by becoming a student in Oxford University. This argument is based on the familiar intercourse into which he would be brought with the most able and influential Protestants of his own age whom England produces. So far as regards doctrine and opinion, he is the best Catholic who is most docile to the teaching of the Holy See. Take, then, some youth of active intellect, who has hitherto been thus Catholically trained, but whose principles are not yet firmly rooted (as is evident from the very fact that his education is still in progress), and who is now more open to

new impressions than at any other period of his life. Consider, further, that (human nature being what it is) his intrinsic bias, apart from Divine Grace, is intensely opposed to intellectual submission of every kind. If, then, in every other instance fearful injury is done to the workings of Grace by free social intercourse with those oppositely minded, what is there to make this particular case an exception? Just as a man, habitually tempted to profligacy, will most certainly yield to the temptation, if he freely and eagerly associates with profligates; so a man habitually tempted to intellectual pride (and all intellectual men are grievously tempted to it) will most certainly yield to the temptation, if he freely and eagerly associates with those who make intellectual independence their very boast. But intellectual pride irreconcilably conflicts with docility to the Holy See, and is the direct road to apostacy. We do not understand then how any thinkers can doubt that such student's reverence for Rome, and deference to its teaching, would be indefinitely impaired by habits of familiarity with youths of powerful and energetic mind, who are unanimous in regarding "the maxims of the Papacy, theological, social, and political, as a synonym for everything which is narrow, retrograde, and imbecile"—(p. 386).

Before considering Canon Oakeley's answers to this argument, we will mention one coming from a different quarter, which has surprised us not a little. It has been said that the very fact of mixing with Protestants would stimulate a Catholic to the more careful study, and more jealous maintenance, of Catholic doctrine in its integrity and purity. But surely it might, on the same principle, be argued that a pious youth would receive no injury from familiarity with wicked associates, because the very fact of their presence would stimulate him to a more faithful observance of God's Law and cultivation of the interior life.

Canon Oakeley neither expresses nor implies any such principle as this; very far from it. On looking, however, through his appendix, we find three different answers to the argument on which we have just insisted. Firstly, he says (p. 37) that cricket and boat-racing, far more than graver subjects, form the main staple of Oxford conversation. If he is speaking of ordinary and every-day youths, we were never so absurd as to doubt this; but such a fact is altogether irrelevant to our argument. If, on the other hand, he means that when youths of keen and earnest intelligence congregate together they seldom speak except of cricket and boating, we are a good deal surprised at his opinion.

Secondly, he replies, that the Catholic superiors would

"regulate" the youth's "intercourse with Protestant companions;" and "moderate, or even interdict it in the case of those with whom it might be dangerous" (p. 39). Now even if any one could countenance such an application of private-school discipline to University life, let the case be considered as we stated it:—

A young Catholic, of active and energetic mind, comes up to Oxford; of course he eagerly desires to acquaint himself and interchange ideas with other active and energetic minds; and, unless he is already almost saintly, he greatly prefers their society to that of his more orthodox but more humdrum fellow-Catholics. The charm of novelty is superadded: he has known Catholics all his life, but Protestant society is an untasted excitement—(pp. 400, 401).

Such a youth, however, Canon Oakeley supposes, may be debarred by his superiors, for his soul's good, from gratifying this taste. What would result, we ask, from such a prohibition, except so much irritation and disgust, that the remedy would be as bad as the disease? But a very little consideration will surely show how unpractical is the whole suggestion. The author accepts our illustration of the University debating society; some would be permitted, others forbidden, to join it, because superiors judged that it would expose one class, but not the other, to spiritual peril. Why, such a discipline, if we could imagine it adopted, must simply issue in heart-burnings, jealousies, resentments, and disaffection. We may add that the members of such a college would be laughing-stocks to the whole University.

But, thirdly, the author seems to retract his former judgment on the seriousness of this evil. In his pamphlet he urged most forcibly that Catholic parents "might as reasonably expect their children to come out from a furnace unscorched, as to preserve incorrupt the heritage of their faith, after being exposed to such an ordeal" as that of "mixing habitually with Protestants before they go out into the world" (p. 13). But now he says that reading anti-Catholic literature is "far more likely" to be "dangerous" (pp. 37, 38); and that this they will do under every possible arrangement. We will not here enlarge on the trite theme of personal influences; on the kind of magnetic attraction exercised by intellectual men over those with whom they are brought into frequent contact; because a simple *reductio ad absurdum* will suffice for our purpose. If familiar acquaintance with the *Saturday Review* is as dangerous as familiar acquaintance with *Saturday Reviewers*, it follows, by parity of reason, that the regular perusal of Catholic literature would be as complete a safe-

guard as the constant presence of Catholic superiors. Yet the author himself maintains earnestly that the presence of such superiors is absolutely necessary to preserve a Catholic student from the gravest calamities.

We observe, however, that the author refers, with a certain irony, to "undergraduate eloquence." He may possibly, therefore, intend to imply that Oxford undergraduates, in consequence of their youth, are less likely to exercise serious influence on a student, than are either Catholic superiors on the one hand, or mature anti-Catholic writers on the other. For ourselves, we hold strongly the opposite opinion; viz., that a youthful thinker will be more wrought on by those of his own age, than by those older and more mature. He finds in the former a freshness of mind, a readiness of sympathy, a corresponding susceptibility of impression, an unreservedness, a frankness in comparing notes and admitting difficulties, nay, a congeniality arising from the very fact that they are of the same age with himself, which are most attractive to an ardent inquirer after truth, and which are found to a much less extent in the society of older men. We are only aware of one even apparent exception to our statement; and that one is apparent only, and not real. We refer to F. Newman's influence at Oxford some twenty-five years ago; an influence to which, we believe, the most distant parallel has never existed either before or since. Now if we were to speculate on the great secret of this extraordinary power, we should be inclined to rest it mainly on the circumstance that he retained those charms of intellectual youthfulness which we have just recounted, in a degree which has perhaps never been approached by any other thinker equally profound. But, however this may be, what directly affected any given admirer was not Mr. Newman, but the enthusiasm felt for Mr. Newman by those of the students' own contemporaries to whom he was most powerfully attracted. It is well known that those admirers formed so large a class, as wholly to suffice for their own social needs; and that there was very little of hearty and confidential intercourse between them and others. But the whole influence exercised on a Catholic student by those Protestants with whom he should associate, would be not in enhancement, but eminently in disparagement, of his superiors' claim to intellectual respect.

There is another matter, not of very great importance, but which it is perhaps better not to leave unnoticed. Judging from experience, we should say that Canon Oakeley (p. 41) very greatly overrates the separation between undergraduates of different colleges. Perhaps the state of things varies a

good deal at different times. Certainly when the present writer was a commoner at Christ Church, he was, beyond comparison, on terms of more familiar intercourse with leading members of the debating society who belonged to other colleges, than with other undergraduates who belonged to his own; and was intimately acquainted with many more youths of Balliol alone than of Christ Church. This was no doubt an extreme case; but it illustrates the then general circumstances of Oxford undergraduate society.

The sum of our argument, then, was this: If the proposal in question were carried out, the few highly intellectual students of the Catholic College would suffer grievous detriment to the purity, simplicity, and humility of their faith from the circumambient anti-Catholic and unbelieving atmosphere. They would, in their turn, communicate the infection to their Catholic brethren; the college would become a permanent and traditional home of unsound and disloyal Catholicism; and the plague of indifferentism would possess the whole rising generation of English Catholics.

We have argued throughout that this proposal would be—not less good than some other, but—absolutely and, indeed, intolerably bad. It is not at all necessary, then, for the integrity of our reasoning, to defend any rival project as practicable and desirable, because our position is that to do nothing at all is immeasurably better than to do what Canon Oakeley is disposed to recommend. We expressed an opinion, indeed (which we undoubtedly entertain), that a Catholic University or higher college in England would be the best means of supplying a confessed desideratum; but hardly any part of our argument (or, rather, no part at all) was directed to this conclusion. We may possibly consider the question hereafter; but here we are only concerned with a vindication of what we have already advanced.

Our author raises the question (pp. 44, 45) whether Catholic gentlemen would be deterred from sending their sons to Oxford, however strong might be the warning against such a course put forth by the Holy Father and bishops. We do not think so ill of them as to doubt that on such a matter the great majority would be docile to the Church's guidance; and we also believe that the few youths who might be sent to Oxford in the teeth of such authoritative warning, would have a life-long brand fixed on their name, and would be ever regarded with suspicion as having received an education dangerous to faith and morals. But let us suppose, for argument's sake, that the case were otherwise, that not more than, say, one-tenth of the English Catholic gentry were docile

to the Church's voice; even so it would be immeasurably better that one-tenth should escape the foul contagion than that all, without exception, should be exposed to its virulence.

Nor again can we at all understand why the author should take for granted that those parents, who would send their sons to Oxford in defiance of the Church's solemn warning, would send them to a Catholic college there rather than to Christ Church or Balliol. Such deplorable Catholics as the hypothesis supposes would be far more keenly alive to the social advantages exclusively obtainable in a place like Christ Church, than to the spiritual evils of which it might be the occasion.

Our conclusion, then, is still the same in regard to the proposal of a Catholic college at Oxford. If we view that proposal in its bearing on Catholic interests, we contend that it does not offer one single advantage, while it would introduce evils of the gravest and most alarming character. Better a thousand times that the sons of our gentry should lose all opportunity of a higher education (though no such alternative is really before them), than that, in obtaining it, they should learn to swell the ranks of that anti-Catholic, anti-Roman, irreligious liberalism which is the misery of our time.

We now turn to the "Catholic Layman," and heartily assure him that we attach the fullest credit to his explanations. Wherever, deliberately and on reflection, he assures us that the meaning of any thing which he has written is different from that which we ascribed to it, we have no doubt at all that we misconceived his meaning. But we have carefully looked at every passage to which his comments refer; and we must maintain that in every case we have given to his words their obvious and (objectively speaking) their legitimate sense. For a reason, which will appear as we proceed, we notice his complaints in an order slightly different from that in which he has stated them.

(1.) He denies our right to say that he "disparaged" the Oxford "professorial teaching." We quoted in a note those words of his on which we rested our criticism (p. 388), and they run thus:—"The action of the University as a teacher is extremely feeble." Now "the action of the University as a teacher" is synonymous with "professorial" as distinct from tutorial "teaching;" and to say that it is "extremely feeble" is surely to disparage it. We now quite believe that he did not mean this, but we had then no clue to his meaning except his words.

(2.) He denies that he intended to "disparage altogether the advantage of University examinations:" he disparaged,

he says, only "those examinations which imply no more than a superficial knowledge;" while "of the Oxford examinations" he "thinks most highly." We accept his statement unreservedly; we withdraw, therefore, our allegation to the contrary, and we withdraw (3) a third allegation, which we founded on the two former, viz., that "he regards free social intercourse with Protestants not only as a good, but as *the* one great good which he contemplates" by his scheme.

But we are still of opinion that our interpretation of his argument about examinations (p. 12-15) was, objectively speaking, its legitimate interpretation. It is true, indeed, that its immediate occasion was the London University, but there was nothing in his language which could lead one even to dream that he intended to distinguish between one kind of examination and another. Take, for instance, the two following extracts from his pamphlet:—

Education is not to be tested by *the amount of information possessed at any given moment*, but by the mode in which it is possessed, and by which it has been acquired. It is no exaggeration to say that a man may answer every question put to him at an *examination*, and yet be extremely inferior in education to another who is unable to answer a single one of those questions—(pp. 12, 13).

The very end of education is not to stock the memory with the proper replies to an *indefinite number of questions which may be addressed to it* on the greatest possible variety of subjects, but to train the mind, &c.—(p. 14).

These two extracts are very fair samples of the whole passage. And every one will have understood them, we think, to draw a contrast, not between a good and a bad method of examination, but between directing the youth's studies to an examination on the one hand, and training his mind in some different way on the other hand. And there was a further reason also, which would have prevented the idea from ever crossing our mind that the writer intended only to contrast good examinations with bad, and that he admired the Oxford examining system. For it was his very purpose to extol the educational advantages of Oxford; and yet he did not drop a single hint throughout that he included the examinations in their number.

(4.) "*Mediaeval Oxford and Cambridge*," he had said (pp. 37, 38), "were great universities, and had all the advantages and disadvantages, moral and intellectual, which are peculiar to universities." We understood him to mean here "which are common to universities;" for why otherwise should he think as a matter of course that Oxford and Cambridge had them *all*? He explains, however, that he used the word "peculiar," as he

might say that "certain vices are peculiar to Italians." By the latter phrase he would mean, we suppose, that Italians, and they alone, are fully capable of such vices. If he used the word in this sense, the preceding sentence means that "Mediæval Oxford and Cambridge possessed all the advantages of which an university is capable, but at the same time (strangely and unfortunately) all the disadvantages to which an university is liable." Here we really doubt whether on reflection he will continue to think that such was his meaning.

(5.) Lastly, the "Catholic Layman" explains that his note at pp. 47, 48, was not intended as an argument for his own general conclusion, but was only introduced to correct a certain prejudice of "ignorant Catholics." We think that as the note stands in connection with the passage to which it is appended, a different impression would legitimately be conveyed; though we have the author's assurance (which we fully credit) that such an impression would be mistaken. In regard, however, to the main conclusion of his pamphlet, the argument in question was by no means neutral, but, on the contrary, told powerfully against that conclusion. We were fully warranted, therefore, in calling it "suicidal."

These are our author's explanations; and since they in no respect affect the reasoning of our article, we have fulfilled our duty in the matter by putting them on record, so that our readers may do him no injustice. We greatly regret, however, to find him endorsing the strange argument, that no Catholic youths would endanger the simplicity and purity of their faith at a Protestant University, unless they were "sneaks, milksops, or idiots." We have repeatedly expressed the reasons which lead us to a most opposite opinion; but we will here use an *argumentum ad hominem*. He fully admitted in his pamphlet (p. 19), "that hardly is there to be found any atmosphere more powerful than that of the two [English Protestant] Universities to transform and assimilate those who live in it to its own properties." In making this admission did he confine their evil effect to sneaks, milksops, and idiots? Did he not, on the contrary, admit the reality and the fearfulness of that evil which we dread? The question debated between him and us turned wholly on the sufficiency of such safeguards as he recommended; there was no question at all as to the magnitude and universality of the danger.

We are lastly to speak of F. Rawes's most able and telling pamphlet; a work so sustained in interest, so lively and spirited in language, that no one (we predict) who begins it, will willingly pause till he has read it through. If we were to make

any unfavourable criticisms on so attractive a book, they would be such as the following :—The author sometimes, we think, pushes into a certain exaggeration doctrines which are most true in themselves, and most necessary for these times. Again, in his opening paragraph, we think, he has considerably underrated the amount of good Catholic feeling which the “Layman” exhibits; and, moreover, while many of his replies to that writer are amusingly cogent and overwhelming (see *e.g.* pp. 11, 13, 15, 16, 24, 27), on other occasions he does not seem fully to apprehend his opponent’s argument. Lastly, the pamphlet strikes us as somewhat ill-arranged. But we have really no heart to dwell on comparative trifles, when a work so truly refreshing comes before us; such an oasis in the desert of contemporary literature. The animating spirit of the whole is in a most unusual degree unworldly, Christian, and loyal to the Holy See. His criticisms on the “Layman” are, no doubt, straightforward and pungent; but men of all parties, we are persuaded, will admit that they contain no particle of bitterness or unkindliness. The temper in which F. Rawes writes is removed as far as possible from that which would either inflict an unnecessary wound, or envenom a wound which it was necessary to inflict.

On the question before us he takes exactly the same view as ourselves. He does not think that there are certain advantages on the one side to be balanced against certain disadvantages on the other, but that the whole scheme is fraught with the most alarming evils, savours of the most anti-Catholic spirit, and is to be resisted by every loyal son of the Church “tooth and nail”—(p. 7).

I look upon this proposition as only one of those many developments and signs which we see everywhere around us of that spirit of worldliness which is coming on on the Church—(p. 1). I believe it to be contrary to the instinct of the faithful, contrary to the sense of the priesthood in this country, and contrary to a true spirit of loyalty to the Church—(p. 2). We cannot see that to put souls in unnecessary peril, especially for mere worldly advantages, is either expedient, or prudent, or just; and therefore, as we believe that this Oxford scheme is contrary to Christian prudence and Christian expedience, and also to Christian justice, we oppose it with all our strength—(p. 23). My reason and my feelings, my whole mind and instincts, are against the plan you advocate: I am convinced it is full of deadly peril to souls—(p. 31). Its opponents feel it to be a question of the most vital importance; . . . a question on which, so to say, they would neither give nor take quarter—(p. 32).

Such being F. Rawes’s estimation of the scheme, it was in no respect necessary for his argument to consider the question

of alternatives at all ; for he would regard it as immeasurably better to do nothing than to do this. He does, however, give a positive opinion on alternatives, and a very explicit one. He considers (1) that any Catholic parent, who, at this moment, desires a higher education for his children, should send them to the Irish Catholic University (pp. 3, 9, 67); and here we thoroughly agree with him. He considers (2) that "the right thing in the right place,"—the end, therefore, to be constantly kept in view,—*"is a Catholic University in England"* (p. 3); and here also we are in complete accordance. He considers (3) that Catholics have at this moment full resources for the immediate establishment at least of a college for higher education. On this matter one thing is very plain, viz., that if English Catholics at this moment can establish a Catholic college at Oxford, much more can they establish one out of Oxford; for the latter task is far easier than the former. (See note to p. 374 in our former article.) Our own impression is that there are resources for establishing a college which would be far better than nothing; but not for establishing one which shall at first be commensurate with the full exigencies of the case. But (4) F. Rawes even thinks (pp. 66, 67) that English Catholics, if they please, can at once erect an institution which shall deserve the name of University. On this we are somewhat sceptical.

We will now give a few miscellaneous quotations from this charming book. We only wish we had room for many more :—

If it has pleased God that we should belong to a Church, which for so long in this land has been trodden down and persecuted, and which is only now emerging from penal laws and social persecution, we must take one thing with another and be thankful; and not grumble if there are a few knots in the rope as it slips through our hands. Most of us who have had the priceless blessing of a conversion to the Faith have suffered more or less in our worldly prospects, but I have never heard any one complain of this; indeed I may say truly that I have never known any one so mean-spirited as to feel it. And why should any expect to have everything just as they like in this matter of Education? You say that you know of "many parents" who "intend to send their sons to Protestant colleges if a Catholic college be not soon founded." Well, that is their look out. If they so far forget their duty to God and their children and their own consciences, they will have to settle the matter one day with their Judge. Their doing it will not make it right; and if the Church does all that she can for them, she will not be to blame. The Church always does that which is best in the highest sense for her children; but she is never led by the whims and fancies of the many, still less of the few. It is simply unreasonable to expect that everything can be done in a moment. As you know of these persons and their intention, the best thing you can do is to warn them, if you have an opportunity, against

carrying their intentions into effect. You might know of a burglar who intended to break into the house of one of your friends, unless he sent him a twenty-pound note; but you would not, I suppose, recommend your friend to send it. But what makes this case, of which I am speaking, worse, is that you have said in another place: "Those Catholic parents who have done so would perhaps be as little disposed as any one to defend on principle what they have done under peculiar circumstances." Did you correct the proof of your letter? Or has this sentence got in somehow when you never wrote it? Are men who can act like this to be brought forward as examples or arguments? Surely this is doing evil that evil may come; or at most that some supposed worldly advantage may come. The next time I hear of a man committing forgery I shall say: "He who has done so would perhaps be as little disposed as any one to defend on principle what he has done under the influence of peculiar circumstances." What should you think of my moralizing in this case?—(pp. 4, 5).

You say, "Can you prevent a youth of twenty or twenty-one from frequenting the society of his father's friends and being fascinated by their follies and vices?" What is this? Can I believe my eyes? If any father of "a youth of twenty or twenty-one" is so lost to all sense of shame as to have "friends" whose "vices" are likely to fascinate his son; if still further he is not ashamed of degrading himself by throwing his son into their company, then all I can say is that he has forgotten the Day of Judgment and is not fit to approach the Sacraments. How can he be, when he is leading his own son into sin?—(pp. 20, 21).

All writers on spiritual science agree that intercourse with Protestants, except for the purpose of converting them, is hurtful to the soul. No one can court Protestant society and live much in it, without losing the brightness of his spiritual vision and, in a great measure, the instincts and sympathies of the faith—(p. 21).

There is a view of religion prevailing amongst a few men of strong digestions and great physical powers, which is called muscular Christianity. This is the lowest and meanest view of Christianity which has ever been devised by the misguided intellect of man. Such a view cannot exist in the Church, because it is not possible that any one can hold it who has any knowledge whatever of Divine grace, whether that knowledge be theoretical or practical. But there is something quite analogous to it to be found in the Church; and that is the worship of intellect for itself, and a mistaken view of the part which that power performs in the growth of the soul in grace. And yet nothing can be more absurd than this. *We might just as well worship strength of body as strength of intellect.* God gives us both. And I love Him for all the bodily health and strength which He gives to His creatures, as I love Him for all the intellectual strength which He gives them: but I am not going to forget the Giver in the gifts, or think that either of them have any value except as they lead to Him—(p. 49).

I love the old way along which so many millions have gone to their rest: and the old light which has shone ceaselessly and brightly through the darkness of so many thousand midnights and the spray of so many thousand storms. I love and trust the Holy See, not only as to faith and morals, but

in all its traditions and judgments and ways. Even in natural things, out of its own immediate order, I love its very shadow and trust to it for safety. It is the representative of God in the world; the great barrier against lawlessness of every kind. Both in thought and in action it sets the bounds beyond which no man has a right to go. Freedom of thought is simply a delusion of the devil. A man has no more right to *think* about anything in any way he pleases, than he has to *do* anything in any way he pleases. If men were allowed to do what they like all governments must perish; and if men were to be allowed to think what they like, the spiritual Kingdom would be destroyed. That spiritual Kingdom is destroyed, wherever men think as they please. There are men who cut themselves off from the Church and proclaim the right of free inquiry: but they are in a state of intellectual anarchy. It is indeed spiritual anarchy, but that is worse than the other. Thus Protestantism in the logical consequences of its doctrines is antinomian in thought and deed. If every man has a right to inquire for himself, who has a right to blame the conclusions, whatever they may be, to which he sincerely comes? But the Church sets a guard over her children's souls, for she knows what it costs to redeem them: she bears always in mind the Passion and Death of Jesus, His Cross and Precious Blood and Sacred Heart. I always think that nothing shows her divine care and watchfulness more than the *Index Expurgatorius*. Divinely watchful for souls, she examines the literature of the world; and divinely guided in her judgments, she proscribes the books that have evil in them. I glory in the Church's *Index* of those poisonous books that would bring peril to her children. If she did not act thus she could not be the representative of the Good Shepherd. The *Index* is not only a protection for the weak, but it is a logical consequence of the Infallibility of the Church. And the reason why I love it so much is because the world fears it and hates it so much. And great need have we to take all care in these evil days. For now I am certain that infidelity is in the air. Just as a pestilence or an epidemic comes and we know not why, and men say 'it must be in the air,' so I am persuaded, as I say, that unbelief is hanging round us, like the very air we breathe—(pp. 70, 71).

Now, lastly, how does Catholic opinion in England stand on this truly momentous question? F. Rawes (p. 8) speaks of "multitudes" as agreeing with him; while as to the supporters of this scheme, "I feel certain," he says, "that the estimate of their numbers is greatly exaggerated . . . Poll the priests of this land, and eleven out of twelve will be against you; poll the laity, and five out of six will be against you"—(p. 34). This is a matter on which F. Rawes has far more means of judging than we have; and we are delighted with his statement.

In counting numbers, moreover, there is one very important consideration to be borne in mind. Among those who defend the project are included two most opposite classes, which differ more from each other than either class differs from ourselves. We hold, as a matter of doctrine, that he is the best Catholic

in point of faith, who most absolutely subjects his reason to the teaching of the Holy See; and we maintain, as a matter of fact, that a Catholic College at Oxford would infuse, with fatal potency, the precisely opposite spirit. Now some supporters of the scheme, such, *e.g.*, as Canon Oakeley, agree with us on the question of doctrine, but differ from us on the question of fact; while other supporters of the same scheme agree with us on the question of fact, though most widely divergent from us on the question of doctrine. A thinker of this latter class recommends the Oxford project precisely because he sees that it would bring youthful Catholics (as he would express it) into greater harmony with their Protestant fellow-countrymen; because he sees that the rising generation, if educated at Oxford, would lay more stress on national ties, and less on ecclesiastical, than their forefathers have done. This is not the place to stigmatise as it deserves the odious and irreligious character of an end, which several Catholics really pursue. We are here but making one obvious remark. Of the two classes of men who support the project, one class differs from us on doctrine, and the other on fact; but the two classes differ from each other, both on doctrine *and* on fact.

Or, to put the same thing in a different way: In this and the preceding article on the same subject, we have laboured to establish the proposition, that a Catholic College at Oxford would, to a perfect certainty, indefinitely impair habits of loyalty and intellectual subjection to the Holy See. Among the upholders of this proposition must be counted, not only those who on such a ground detest and abhor the proposal, but they also who on the same ground advocate and support it.

Meanwhile, it is the greatest of comforts to reflect that this is not a matter on which we are at the mercy of the shifting quicksands of public opinion. It is our happy privilege as Catholics that no such scheme can ever be attempted, without express sanction from the Holy See and the English Episcopate. We share F. Rawes's confidence that no such sanction will be given.

ART. VII.—THIERS'S "WATERLOO."

Waterloo. Par M. A. THIERS. Paris : L'Heureux. 1862.

Waterloo: the Downfall of the First Napoleon. A History of the Campaign of 1815. By GEORGE HOOPER. London : Smith, Elder, & Co. 1862.

Histoire de la Campagne de 1815. Par EDGAR QUINET. Paris : Levy. 1862.

M. THIERS, in writing an account of the Battle of Waterloo, undertook a most difficult task. He had to propitiate the *amour propre* of his countrymen, which had been so grievously wounded by that great military reverse, and he had to maintain the leading theory of his "History of the Consulate and the Empire," that the Emperor Napoleon was an infallible captain, as great in the art of war as M. Thiers himself in statecraft and political science. He applies the requisite salve to his countrymen's wounds by praising, and not unduly, the gallantry of the host which the Imperial General led to signal and complete defeat; by exaggerating, by dwelling somewhat more, and in more melo-dramatic vein than is usually considered permissible to a historian, on all those incidents in the campaign which reflected so much credit on the French arms; by clothing such episodes of success in language dear to French vanity or ambition; and, whilst omitting counterbalancing instances of heroism or military virtue on the other side, and raking up apocryphal stories of the sayings and doings of subordinate actors, by adopting, as the result of what at first sight might appear to be learned and ingenious criticism, the theory of the incapacity of the English and Prussian leaders, and the futility of their plan of operations, as a foil to the brilliant strategy and unrivalled energy of Napoleon.

M. Thiers supports this theory, which is to retain the Emperor on the pinnacle to which he has raised him, by giving him a plan of campaign faultlessly conceived and admirably carried out, so far as it was possible for the military idol he worships to carry out his own plans. But in doing all this—in according not more than due praise to the "Grande Armée," in extolling their leader, and depreciating the military talents of Wellington and Blücher—M. Thiers creates for himself a great difficulty: for the plan of the campaign thoroughly miscarried, and its issue was not what might have

been expected from the premises ; but for France, the occupation of Paris, and the treaties of 1815 ; and for Napoleon, the exile of St. Helena, and political annihilation. Such a theory and such a result required one or more victims, and M. Thiers has accordingly immolated the Marshals Ney, Soult, and Grouchy at the altar of his idol. Ney was feeble and timid until it became necessary that he should be rash, and he was either rash or feeble as the necessities of the theory required of him. Soult was a very poor major-general of the army, or, as we should say, chief of the staff. He failed to understand and express Napoleon's thought and intention ; he was dilatory in despatching orders ; and he did not take ordinary precautions for their safe arrival. But Grouchy is the principal victim. This general failed on all points—even on those plain to the common soldier—and lost his head ; until, having beaten the Prussian division left at Wavre, he heard of the great disaster at Waterloo, when, his incapacity being of no further use to the argument, he recovered his faculties, and in the masterly retreat to Paris performed one of the most brilliant feats, and the only successful one, of the war. It will at once be seen that the adoption of M. Thiers's theory of the campaign, whilst it leaves to Napoleon the honour of devising the most scientific and brilliant manœuvres, fixes on him the fault of choosing incapable instruments for executing them, and this from amongst officers and generals of his own forming, who had attained their rank as his lieutenants.

It was impossible for M. Thiers to write a history of the Battle of Waterloo without finally announcing the complete rout of the French army. Yet he takes the reader by surprise when he comes to the catastrophe, for the French troops have been everywhere victorious. After "deciding the defeat" of the Prussians on his right, the Emperor leads his choicest infantry against the British centre to sustain his cavalry, already supported by the infantry of his right wing, and in possession of the ridge of the plateau of Mont St. Jean. By the apparition of the troops of the Prussian general, Ziethen, on the extreme left of the British line, and by a mixed crowd of English and Prussian cavalry charging the columns which the Emperor was himself leading to the attack, the battle seems in a moment to have been lost, or rather, the French troops retire that they may not be cut off. Then comes the rout. "Drunk with joy" (says M. Thiers), "the English general, who until then had confined himself to the defensive, assumes the offensive, and carries forward his line against our battalions of the Guard, reduced by more than half." (A reduction, by

the by, which M. Thiers has not accounted for by any military incident.) "From right to left the English and Prussian armies march on us, *preceded by their artillery*, which vomits a destructive fire." This is very melo-dramatic, but we miss from this way of telling the story all the real facts of the case. We had, according to M. Thiers, been *enfoncés, culbutés, tués, sabrés, mis en pièces, horriblement massacré*, all day—whole divisions had been *presque détruits*, and one regiment, we believe, was *haché en entier*; the celebrated cavalry charge alone had inflicted on us a loss of 10,000 men, at the cost of only 4,000 to the French. After all this, M. Thiers might have allowed us to do something better worth telling than making part of a tumultuary crowd of cavalry. The Prussians, too, had been defeated. Yet, after defeating them and maltreating us, M. Thiers tries still to gain a point for those whose defeat he is obliged to narrate, and so he makes the French army yield to a larger number of men than were ever on the field. He gives Wellington 75,000,* and attributes to Bulow 30,000;† to Pirch, 15,000;‡ and to Ziethen nearly as many.§ These, nearly 135,000 men in all, he, a few pages after, calls 140,000||, and these figures, in a few pages further on, swell to 150,000.¶ To these forces he opposes only 68,000 French troops at any moment on the field. Now, according to the best authorities, the Duke of Wellington brought 68,524, say 69,000 men, into the field, and the Prussians, at the very utmost, only 51,000,** but probably fewer by the end of the day, whilst the French army really numbered 72,000 men. Thus M. Thiers's 135,000, and his subsequent 140,000, and his final 150,000, were really not so many as 120,000, whilst the 68,000 who were overwhelmed were really 72,000. We adduce this simply as an example of M. Thiers's mode of dealing, not only with facts, but even with his own figures. As we are on the point, we will give one other example of his talent for inventing facts to suit his theory, or which are available for the impression he wishes to produce. The battle, he says, cost the French army "twenty and some thousands of men, comprising the 5,000 or 6,000 wounded†† remaining in the hands

* P. 212. † P. 268. ‡ P. 273. § *ib.* || P. 279. ¶ P. 287.

** Mr. Hooper makes the Prussians engaged amount to 51,000. But Colonel Chartras, who enters into far more details, limits them to 45,000. "Bulow," says Colonel Chartras, "agit avec vingt neuf mille hommes; Ziethen avec une division d'infanterie et presque toute sa cavalerie; Pirch I. avec deux divisions d'infanterie, et deux brigades de cavalerie. On peut donc estimer à quarante-cinq mille hommes au plus, la force des troupes Prussiennes qui prirent part à la bataille de Waterloo"—(p. 368).

†† P. 293.

of the English;" and, on the same page, he says that the French lost no prisoners except the wounded. "The losses of the English" (he declares) "were very nearly equal to our own, and those of the Prussians were from 8,000 to 10,000 men. Thus the day had cost the Allies 30,000 men, but had not cost them, as it had us, the victory."

We have never seen in anything which could be called an authority so low an estimate as the above of the losses of the French, or so high a one of those of the English and Prussians. The French losses, however, are only to be estimated, as they cannot be proximately ascertained. The army was not simply defeated, it was utterly routed; and its remains, a vast horde of fugitives, were literally drummed out of Belgium by the Prussians. We most sincerely pity so gallant a host—so vast an organization of brave men and accomplished soldiers—this so terrible a termination to so short and previously brilliant a campaign. But the fact remains, that after a long and unprecedentedly bloody battle, the French army was not beaten simply, but utterly routed. Now, we conceive it to be neither for the honour of the French arms, nor for the military renown of the leader of so gallant a host of veterans, that the loss of the French army should be so small in comparison with that inflicted on their enemies. We believe that the common opinion, derived from the estimates of military writers, that the loss of the French was upwards of 30,000 men; that of the English half as many; and that of the Prussians 7,000 at the most, is not only more correct than the figures given, without any authority, by M. Thiers, but also more creditable to the French army.

The assertion that the French lost no prisoners except the wounded is not only untrue, but may be contradicted out of M. Thiers's own mouth, for at page 244 he says that "the unsuccessful grand attack on the English left cost the corps of D'Erlon about 3,000 men in killed, wounded, and prisoners." The fact being, that 3,000 was about the French loss in prisoners only, and 2,000 to 3,000 the loss in killed and wounded. In this first grand attack on the English position the French also lost two eagles, those of the 45th and 105th regiments. M. Thiers no doubt thinks to glorify the French arms by asserting, what has since been conclusively proved to be untrue, that the army lost but one eagle, and he claims for the French the capture of six flags taken by the cavalry from British infantry regiments. As these assertions are not made in juxtaposition, it is quite possible that M. Thiers may not wish his readers to infer that

the capture of a British flag is by any means an equivalent evidence of victory to the capture of a French eagle. The fact is, that the "flag" is used in the British army in just eight times the proportion to the eagle in the French army, and that it is a far more conspicuous object than the eagle, far less portable, and more difficult to conceal or make off with. As an equivalent to the eagle which M. Thiers admits to have been captured and retained, the French should have taken more than eight regimental flags. But supposing even, which would no doubt have been still dearer to French ears than the facts as they really were—supposing that we had lost very many more flags than M. Thiers, misled by a French invention, pretends, and that the French had not lost one eagle, so much the more honour to us, and so much the less to them. For what English flags were taken would have been taken at the price of the lives of their defenders; whilst every French eagle that escaped was saved only, like every soldier of the French army, by headlong flight or astute concealment. Every eagle which reached Paris was the trophy, not of fight, but of flight—the prize, not of the stoutest heart, but of the swiftest foot. M. Thiers estimates his countrymen lower than we do if the narrative of this great battle of giants, which he adopts and glosses over, is calculated to soothe the pangs of defeat. A querulous complaint against everything which ought not to have been but which was; a depreciation of all men except one, who happened to be defeated, but was to be brought off the field the greatest captain of his time, there as elsewhere, at Waterloo as at Austerlitz; an exaggeration of the numbers of the allied armies, of their losses, and of the degree of success which attended every one of the three leading attacks of the French—these are all intended to keep out of sight that the French were out-generalled and out-fought; that the allied plan of action succeeded; and that Napoleon's failed, not only in its one main feature, but in every detail. Brilliantly conceived, and executed with sufficient success up to the morning of the 16th, it broke down irremediably on the evening of that day.

As M. Thiers's account of the battle of Waterloo, and of the campaign of hours, is the last French one, and likely, from its matter, the reputation of the writer, and the perspicuity of its style, enlivened by many interesting and authentic anecdotes, and by some apocryphal ones of a popular character, to meet with much acceptance in France, we will, as briefly as may be, give an outline of some at least of its main features.

On the early morning of the 7th of June the French army,
VOL. IV.—NO. VII. [*New Series.*]

of 124,000 men,* were distributed in cantonments from Lille to Metz, behind a strong line of fortresses. The corps of Count Lobau and the Imperial Guard were still at Paris.

The Prussian army of 120,000† extended from Liége to Charleroy, with outlying posts extending to Binche. This army occupied both banks of the Sambre.

The allied army, under the command of the Duke of Wellington, consisted, according to M. Thiers, of 100,000 men, of whom 38,000 were English.‡ The right under Lord Hill extended from Oudenarde to Ath; the left under the Prince of Orange from Ath to Nivelles; the reserve was at Brussels under the Duke's immediate command.

Before entering upon the incidents of the campaign, it will be worth while to consider the relative force of the combatants, and the relative advantages of their positions. In doing this we will accept M. Thiers's figures.

If we look at numbers only, Napoleon, for an aggressive campaign, had only 124,000 men, and 350 guns, to oppose to 220,000 men, and 508 guns. If we accept Napoleon's estimate of the value of the troops engaged, and put down a French and an English soldier as equivalents, but rate 2 Prussians, Hanoverians, Dutchmen, or Belgians, as worth only one Frenchman, the value of the English and Prussian armies as compared with the French army would be practically equal; and the weight of metal of the French guns would do much to restore equality to the artillery.

* Colonel Charras gives the following numbers :—

Infantry	89,415
Cavalry	22,302
Artillery and Engineers	12,371
	<hr/>
Guns	344
	124,088

† The Prussian army was probably numerically stronger than this. The figures, as corrected by Colonel Charras, are :—

Infantry	99,715
Cavalry	11,879
Artillery and Engineers	12,480
	<hr/>
Guns, 312	124,074

‡ Captain Siborne makes the Anglo-allied army amount to 105,950 men, as follows :—

Infantry	82,062
Cavalry	14,482
Artillery and Engineers	9,406
	<hr/>
Guns, 196.	105,950

But the French army was homogeneous, and commanded by a general who had more than the mere confidence of his troops; for they followed him with an energy and devotion, even with a personal affection, which incalculably increased the unity of their force, and the effective value of the courage and training of the army and of the genius of their general. The French army, numbers apart, more completely and favourably represented the military spirit, power, and genius of the French people, than any other army ever did; and they were led by a general in the prime of life,* who was universally considered as the first captain of his age. Moscow, Leipsic, and Fontenoy had not tarnished his reputation with his troops, and it was, perhaps, an universal opinion amongst his followers, that the disasters of the French arms in the Peninsula were due to exceptional circumstances, although something might be allowed to the courage of the English troops, and perhaps to the superior ability of Wellington, as compared with their Emperor's lieutenants; but no one in that armed and disciplined throng of 124,000 Frenchmen thought of comparing our Iron Duke with their Little Corporal on terms approaching to equality.

To the devotion of the French army to their chief, was added the fervour of patriotism, and the energy of national antipathies. They were, indeed, invading Belgium, but they were fighting to defend France from the invader, with the injuries and reverses of 1813-14 to avenge.

The French army, too, was composed of highly-trained and veteran soldiers, inured to war, and adepts at campaigning. Uniquely good, the French Army contained, moreover, a *corps d'élite*, which was a marvel of courage, organisation, and effective strength. When the heavy columns of the Imperial Guard advanced to the attack, every soldier in the army knew that the critical moment had arrived, that the event of the day was about to be decided, and redoubled his exertions in full confidence of victory.

This wondrous military organisation had, however, two weak points, one of which, in our belief, proved fatal to it, whilst it is difficult to assess the amount of unfavourable influence exercised by the other.

The disadvantage which, to our mind, proved fatal, was that the French army was led, not by General Bonaparte, but by the Emperor Napoleon. The risks incurred between the 16th

* Napoleon was born on the 15th August, 1769, and in June, 1815, was consequently 45 years and 10 months old. The Duke of Wellington was born in the same year as Napoleon, and was just turned 46 years of age.

and the night of the 18th were imposed on the *General* by the *Emperor* and the *Politician*. The General might, and we think would, have lost the Belgian campaign, but he would never have incurred the crushing disaster of Waterloo. Victory, and instant victory, was necessary to the politician, who in that character, and in that only, was justified, first in delivering battle without accurate information of the whereabouts and of the force of the Prussian army, and in hurling his last reserves against the English centre, at a moment and under circumstances which left no alternative between a very mediocre success and an annihilating defeat.

The other weak point lay in the *morale* of many of the officers. There were a few desertions, which exercised a remarkable influence on the army. They roused its courage to the pitch of frenzy, but they led them also to distrust other of their officers. All fought well, and the faults since admitted in the tactical movements of the day are by no means traceable to disaffection. But the officers had not, and very justly, that unlimited confidence in Napoleon which was felt by the rank and file. Many of them had met, not only the English, but Wellington, in Spain, and these did not share the confidence of their troops. Napoleon has attempted to ascribe the ultimate panic to treason. His interest in doing so is apparent. But, whilst we fail to trace the influence of treason on the events of the day, we are able to account for them by good strategic and tactical reasons.

The Prussian army had also, though in a far less degree, the advantage of being homogeneous; but this quality applied only to its language and nationality. About one half of this army was composed of Landwehr, but of Landwehr which had, for the most part, participated in the campaign of 1813-14. The whole were animated with a spirit of deadly hatred to the French, and were led by a general of wonderful energy, daring, and courage—a courage proof against all reverses. It was a truly national army, and all its patriotism and passionate hatred of the French were represented and concentrated in Blücher. In the brief campaign we are about to sketch, he showed military capacity of a very high order. But the highest praise which can be claimed for him as a general, will not elevate him to the first rank, nor place him on a level with either Napoleon or Wellington. His energy, fearlessness, audacity, and faith in himself, his country, and his army, played not only a prominent but a decisive part in the campaign as it was actually fought. Napoleon admitted that the old Prince Marshal's flank march from Wavre to Planchenoit was a stroke of genius; but we should ourselves feel more

inclined to rest his reputation on his concentration of three-fourths of his army at Ligny, and on his retreat to Wavre, than on his concerted co-operation with Wellington on the decisive field of Waterloo. The man must not be lost sight of in the general; and the man who at 73 years of age inspired his whole army, not only with confidence, courage, and patriotism, which rose superior to defeat, but with activity and energy, was a hero.

The Anglo-Allied army under Wellington was of most complex and heterogeneous construction. Not only were its various corps of different languages and nationalities, but one of them—the Dutch Belgian—was itself an unfortunate attempt at the amalgamation of discordant materials. This corps was admirably officered, but of very recent organisation; and its efficiency in the field was marred by the national antipathy between Dutchman and Belgian. The cavalry was, for the most part, excellent, yet a whole regiment deserted the field at a critical moment, without a wound to man or horse. The English infantry nobly exhibited the pluck and endurance of the race; but at least half of them were raw troops, with whom it would have been hazardous to manœuvre in the presence of such a general as Napoleon, and in face of such practised and seasoned troops as his soldiers. The artillery was well officered and manned, but was deficient in weight of metal. The King's German Legion was composed of admirable soldiers as well as brave men; and the same praise applies to about one-half of the English infantry. Wellington would have been stronger in the field if he had commanded an army one-third less numerous, but made up of such material as the King's German Legion, or of the best specimens in the field of English, Dutch, or even Belgian troops.

The Anglo-Allied and Prussian forces, considered as one force, were also under the immense disadvantage of being divided under separate commands. If it is not quite true, there is still much truth in the saying of Napoleon, that one bad general is better than two good ones.

On the whole we should conclude that, for a very short campaign, the opposing forces were not so unequally balanced but that a small advantage in generalship on one side or the other might be expected to turn the balance in favour of the better general; provided always that the Anglo-Allied and Prussian armies adopted the method of action—that is of fighting—instead of that of delay, by the mode of retreat and concentration behind Brussels.

Napoleon's most evident advantages lay in the selection of the line of attack, in the unity and efficiency of his army, and in the

common language spoken by his troops and the inhabitants of the country which was the theatre of the war. To balance this, the allies had the advantage of number, and, if political events did not intervene to deprive them of it, of the necessity of retreat by the French general in a prolonged campaign; for it must not be forgotten that an overwhelming force of Austrians and Russians—in fact, that Europe in arms—was approaching the French frontier. The issue of a protracted campaign, if existing combinations were not violently disturbed, could not be doubtful; and the temper of the allied sovereigns, which was the expression of the deep national feeling of their subjects, gave no reason to expect that Napoleon's diplomacy would prove stronger than his armies.

The question involved in the choice between fighting and risking defeat, and retreating and insuring ultimate victory, but for the one chance of the breaking up of the coalition, is a question of politics as well as of military strategy. Setting aside the signal success which attended the resolution of the allied generals, it may, we think, be triumphantly defended on military grounds, without adopting M. Thiers's theory of the military fatuity of Wellington and Blücher, or ascribing their determination to the ambition of Wellington and the hatred of Blücher.

Every ranged battle offers in its result *five* possible but not equally probable issues. Each battle may be indecisive—the attacking party may fail, and each hold his original position; but a drawn battle would, under the circumstances, have proved well-nigh fatal to Napoleon's whole plan of campaign. Either party may obtain a victory, but an indecisive one, like that of Ligny, which leaves the beaten party in good campaigning condition. This involves *two* issues. And finally, either party may inflict on the other a decisive defeat, like that of Waterloo, which again involves two opposite issues.

The allied generals would have the advantage of all these issues except that of decisive defeat—of a rout such as they inflicted on the French. For such a defeat of Wellington at Waterloo as was that of Blücher at Ligny would have left the advantage on the side of the allies; who would have concentrated their forces; would at the utmost have only sacrificed Brussels to the invader; and, adopting the strategy of delay, would have retreated until the advance of Prince Schwartzberg operated a diversion in the French rear, when the plan of passing the frontier on the retreat of the French army in July, would have been adopted.

After the battle of Ligny all moral probability of the total

roust of Wellington passed away—if, indeed, so improbable a contingency at any moment is worth taking into account. He was master of a good line of retreat; the concentration of his outlying forces was easy; and every march backwards rallied troops and supplies to the English army. In point of fact, the contingency of total defeat, of rout and disorganization, is so very improbable that it ought to be left out of the calculation. Whenever it occurs, as in the case of Napoleon at Waterloo, it is quite exceptional, and must be attributed, either to what is called pure accident, or to some cause which is not strictly strategic.

Since, then, the remaining possible issues were, one of them (that, viz., which actually occurred), decisively favourable to the English general, another very favourable (viz., that he should obtain a victory without routing the enemy), and the remaining ones were only less favourable, but still promised the ultimate gain of the campaign; it cannot, we think, be doubted that the allied generals resolved wisely to fight, and that Wellington, with the shelter of the Forest of Soignés in his rear, and with open communications with Brussels and Antwerp, was justified in running the only chance he did run, the chance, that is, that Blücher might not come up in time to make sure of victory on the 18th.

Quite apart from the probabilities that may be inferred from the actual issue of the campaign, there were much sounder strategic reasons for fighting than for retreating; and there is no occasion to account for the plan of campaign adopted by Wellington and Blücher by the ambition of one or the hatred of the other. The Duke might have been ambitious and the Prince Marshal enraged; but why ascribe the best possible movements to ambition and hatred when they can naturally be accounted for on strategic grounds?

The field on which the battle of Waterloo was fought has been so often described that we shall suppose it to be familiar to our readers. Wellington, with 75,000 men, according to M. Thiers, but really with, say, 69,000 men, occupied the plateau of Mont St. Jean, and barred the road to Brussels; Napoleon, with 68,000 men (really with 72,000), occupied the opposite heights, with the object of crossing the intervening valley, dislodging Wellington, seizing the high road to Brussels, and separating the English and the Prussians. The high road to Brussels crossed the valley, and, passing through the centre of the French army, divided the centre of the Duke from his left wing.

On the English left and the French right were some 90,000 Prussians, under Blücher, and some 32,000 French, under

Grouchy. Of these Napoleon knew little or nothing. He had not reconnoitred to his right, but was satisfied, according to M. Thiers, in having given strict instructions to Grouchy to keep up his communications with him. Supposing these instructions to have been as peremptory and clear as M. Thiers represents, but which they were not, Napoleon must have been aware, by the morning of the 18th, that Grouchy had not followed them; for, as a matter of fact, he was only in communication with Grouchy by courier, and had received no reliable account of the movements of the Prussians. Wellington's communications with Blucher were, on the contrary, quite open. He knew exactly the position of the Prussians on the night of the 17th; and the intervening country swarmed with Prussian patrols.

M. Thiers has implicitly adopted Napoleon's statement that he despatched instructions to Grouchy on the night of the 17th, and again on the early morning of the 18th, to occupy, at least with a corps of 7,000 men, the heights of St. Lambert which were some miles on the French right, and were, in fact, occupied by the advanced guard of Bulow's *corps d'armée* by one o'clock on the 18th. M. Thiers admits that Grouchy never received these instructions, but considers such orders to be so simply the dictates of common sense, that he accepts Napoleon as a witness that they were sent, although no record of such orders is to be found in the register of the *état major*; although no one has been able to produce or name the officers who had charge of them; and although the records of other orders are preserved, in which no reference is made to them. If M. Thiers could take a broader view of the question, he would see that, although the despatch of these apocryphal orders would give Napoleon a better plan of battle *as events turned out*, they do not justify him in delivering battle on the 18th, unless it could be shown that besides dispatching them, he knew of their arrival, and of the necessary steps having been taken towards their execution.

The fact seems to be that Napoleon assumed throughout that the defeat of the Prussians at Ligny had put their army out of question for some days; and his circumstances were so desperate that he was content to take the risk of assuming that he had only to deal with the Anglo-Allied army on the 18th. His political situation required a victory over the Duke; and his only chance of it was that he should not have the concentrated armies of Blucher and Wellington on his hands. This depended on the questions, *first*, whether the defeat of Ligny, which had, to his knowledge, cost the

Prussians heavily in killed and wounded, had crippled or demoralized them; and, *secondly*, whether, in case the Prussians turned out to be in fighting condition, Blucher would make the best of the situation, and come to the assistance of the Duke on the 18th.

Napoleon, and, after him, M. Thiers, attempt to make great capital out of the heavy rain which inundated the country between three o'clock on the 17th and the morning of the 18th; and, taking a one-sided and *ex post facto* view of the facts, attribute, in great measure, the loss of the battle to the delay in the attack caused by the state of the valley which the French had to cross to reach the English position. But, admitting that the question turned on the co-operation of Blucher with the Duke, it is evident that the balance of the disadvantage was against the Prussians, for the French were separated from the English by some 1,000 to 1,500 yards only, and had but to encounter the muddy bottom of one valley to reach their position; whilst, to join Wellington, Blucher had to cross some nine miles of country (measured as the crow flies). The only real *accident* which occurred in the leading events of the day, was the fire at Wavre, which delayed Bulow three hours, and this was all in favour of the French general.

The real reasons which delayed the French attack were ordinary military incidents:—The late arrival of General Reille, who had bivouacked at Genappe, and of a portion of Count d'Erlon's corps on the field; and the want of sufficient ammunition, in the early part of the day, to sustain the attack once engaged. Napoleon was always prodigal of ammunition; and, in point of fact, the only guns which were saved from the field of battle were some which were compelled to retire early in the afternoon for want of ammunition. Much has been said of the state of the road from Waterloo to Brussels having indicated all the features of a disastrous fight; and of its having been blocked by fugitives—not only by the wounded, but by many who left the ranks in too great numbers to perform the necessary duty of caring for them, and who never returned. But General Heymès, Ney's chief of the staff, draws a very similar picture of the road to Genappe in the French rear. Speaking of the retirement of the wounded and non-combatants, and of the batteries which left the field after having expended their ammunition, he says:—"This formed a long column, and already bore the appearance of a retrograde march" ("cela formait une longue colonne et ressemblait déjà à une marche rétrograde"). Fortunately for Napoleon's chances of success, he had no such troops as the

Cumberland Hussars in the field, and such of the fugitives as were soldiers were wounded.

The first strategic movement of the day was a *reconnaissance* sent out from the French right, to ascertain the possibility of turning the English left.

The object of Napoleon was to obtain possession of the farm of Mont St. Jean, and seizing then the road to Brussels, to divide Wellington from Blucher, and cut the communications of the former with Brussels. The result of this *reconnaissance* made in the direction of the little hamlet of Smohain, was to show that the inconsiderable brook, on which the hamlet stood, swelled by the heavy rains, and the state of the ground on its banks, would prove an insurmountable obstacle to the attack. Napoleon was therefore compelled to assail the English left by a direct forward movement of his right (the corps of the Count d'Erlon) against it.

Accounts vary as to the moment at which the battle commenced, from 20 minutes past 11 to 12 o'clock. It is probable that the signal from the batteries of the Imperial Guard was given at very near to half-past 11 one way or the other; but that heavy firing only commenced at 12 o'clock.

In front of the English right centre stood the house and farm of Hugoumont. This position—a little advanced fortress—was attacked by the French left (the corps of Count Reille), to withdraw the attention of Wellington from the real point of attack, his left. The attack was in every sense a failure. The Duke defended the post with sufficient reinforcements, but was equally ready for the real attack on his left when it was delivered. M. Thiers and all writers are agreed that the attack on Hugoumont was carried too far. He, in his usual way, excuses Napoleon for this, by blaming his lieutenants, and observing that his own attention was necessarily withdrawn from watching the progress of the attack. So in fact it was. For now Wellington's and Blucher's plan began to be developed. At one o'clock, just as Napoleon was ready to deliver his real attack—just as Ney, with great difficulty, had placed some eighty guns on a rising ground in front of the French right, and was forming his columns of attack—Napoleon's attention was attracted towards his right by the appearance of something which looked like troops on the heights of St. Lambert, some four miles off. Well might his attention be distracted from the too great importance which was being given to the attack of Hugoumont: it was an usual and almost necessary consequence of his being out-maneuvred. A general who fights a battle in ignorance of the doings and whereabouts of 90,000 enemies and 34,000

friends on his right, is very apt to have his attention distracted from the details of what is going on within three or four hundred yards of him. The mystery was soon cleared up: a Prussian hussar was brought in with a letter from Bulow to the Duke. The troops were the advanced guard of 30,000 Prussians under Bulow. But for the fire at Wavre the full 30,000 men would have been there.

This was the first critical moment. Napoleon would infer, not as M. Thiers supposes, that it was certain that Grouchy was coming up to attack these troops in the rear, but that that officer had been deceived and out-generaled, and that the Prussian army was on its way to take part in the fight.

General Buonaparte would have retreated, or, at least, have suspended the battle, which it entirely depended on himself to do, until he had obtained more certain information of the force opposed to him, and of the assistance to be expected from Grouchy. But the *Emperor Napoleon* knew well that though it might be possible to save his army, and fight a long and perhaps successful campaign in defence of Paris, yet that a victory was essential for his personal object of retaining the throne of France, and that a defeat would hardly, in the then state of party feelings in France, damage him more than a retreat. The perseverance of the French Emperor from this point must be considered, then, as dictated by political rather than military reasons. The same observation applies to the subsequent movements of the day, and especially to the last desperate venture of hurling the Imperial Guard and his own personal escort on the English centre, when his whole line of battle was on the point of being broken by the arrival of Ziethen on the field.

What the emperor actually did was to despatch some 2,500 cavalry under General Domont to watch and retard the advance of the Prussians, and to despatch Count Lobau, who commanded the first infantry reserve (some 7,500 men), to choose a favourable position for checking the advance when, later, it might become more formidable. We believe that there is no doubt amongst military men that he should have dispatched this general with at least half his corps to occupy strongly the Bois de Paris, and dispute with Bulow the passage of the Lasne, which he was allowed to cross without any other difficulty than that due to the nature of the ground and the state of the country.

Having given these orders, the French general directed Ney to attack La Haye Sainte, a farmhouse, garden, and

orchard, some 250 yards in advance of the English left centre, with two brigades of D'Erlon's corps and two divisions of cuirassiers, whilst he charged the English left under Picton with the three and a-half remaining divisions of D'Erlon's corps.

They failed to make any impression on La Haye Sainte; two of the three brigades attacking Picton's division were, after putting Bylandt's Belgian brigade to flight, amidst the hisses of the English, Scotch, and Hanoverian troops, behind whom they took shelter, utterly routed by the stubborn resistance of Picton, and by the charge of Vivian's light horse and of two squadrons of Life Guards; the third division (Durutte's) fared better, being last in echelon of support, and consequently not so far advanced as the others.

The net result of this attack was that one-half of D'Erlon's corps was disorganized; that 2,000 prisoners and two eagles were left in the hands of the English; and that two batteries of artillery, which had been advanced well into the valley to support the attack, were rendered useless.

These advantages were dearly purchased. Picton fell, and the Scotch Greys and other English cavalry pursued their success too far and suffered great losses. Napoleon, however, made no further serious attack on the English left throughout the day, and the after fighting in this quarter was confined to a continuous attack by Durutte's division on Papelote and La Haye (not La Haye Sainte)—two groups of cottages in advance of the English extreme left.

This attack, and the rallying of the troops after its disastrous failure, bring us to about three o'clock in the day. At this time Napoleon received disquieting news from his right. The Prussians were advancing and required more than Domont's cavalry to check them; and Grouchy was ascertained to be on the road to Wavre, and not on that to Waterloo.

The French general dispatched Count Lobau with 7,500 infantry to oppose the Prussians, who thus, without firing a shot, except in a cavalry skirmish, reduced the force which Napoleon could direct against Wellington by 10,000 men. This disposed of the whole of the first infantry reserve, but there remained the Imperial guard and an imposing force of cavalry still in reserve.

Lobau was despatched too late. The Prussians were already across the Lasne, in full possession of its defiles and of the Bois de Paris.

Again the thought of retreat must have presented itself to the mind of Napoleon. But he was fighting for a crown, and retreat imported the moral certainty of its loss. It was

not himself, but France only, which could gain by a retreat. Lobau had been kept in reserve to take advantage of—to render decisive—any success against the English left, and was by the failure of that movement of no use where he was; whereas on the banks of the Lasne he might have postponed the effective intervention of the Prussians most materially. This tardy despatch of Lobau's corps of infantry (7,500 bayonets) was to our mind the second error committed by Napoleon. He did not throughout the battle, after choosing the desperate game, play it desperately enough; but wished, until the very last moment, to spare his reserves, when his one only chance of victory lay in the prompt use of *all* his resources.

Judging of the Dutch-Belgian troops by the flight of Bylandt's brigade before the enemy were well within musket range of them, Napoleon was still stronger in troops than Wellington; abstraction made of the slaughter around Hougomont and La Haye Sainte, and the loss by the unsuccessful attack of the English left wing. Taking all this into account, and supposing one-half of the Dutch-Belgian contingent to be useful soldiers, and the rest of the foreign contingents to be equal in value to an equal number of French, the forces left in face of each other under Wellington and Napoleon at this time were about equal.

We are now approaching an episode of the battle with respect to which accounts materially vary.

According to M. Thiers, Napoleon, having rallied D'Erlon's corps, having successfully launched his cavalry against the English horse, and dispatched Lobau to take up a position at right angles with the French extreme left, and in face of the Prussian advance, ordered Ney to take La Haye Sainte, *coute que coute*, and then, having established himself solidly in that post, to wait for further orders; Napoleon's plan being to carry the English centre with an overwhelming force of all arms, after having disposed of, or at least paralyzed for some time, the Prussian attack on his left and rear.

According to M. Thiers, and he is supported in this view by Jomini, Colonel Charras, and Mr. Hooper, Ney succeeded in taking La Haye Sainte at about four o'clock.* According to M.

* Every one knows the confusion which reigns in all accounts of battles as to the time and order of the various incidents. In no case is this confusion more exemplified than in the various accounts given of the time at which the French gained possession of La Haye Sainte. The Duke said that it was taken at *two*; Napoleon at *three*; all the best historians, except Siborne, are agreed that it was about *four*.

We must side with Siborne in fixing the capture at, or some time after,

Thiers himself, however, this was to be "*un coup de désespoir*." And here we pause to remark that this is but one specimen of the naïve admissions of this author; which the thoughtful reader will note as militating strongly against the Napoleonic theory of certain victory but for blundering lieutenants, and the cruel caprices of fortune, which sent torrents of rain, and withheld the sun of Austerlitz. Here (at p. 248) after the failure of the first attack on the weakest point of the English line, and before the commencement of the attack on the English centre, Napoleon's hopes were limited to the results of *one despairing effort*.

Ney (we are still pursuing M. Thiers's narrative), finding himself in possession of La Haye Sainte, believed himself at about half-past four able to *débouche* successfully on the plateau. The extreme left of D'Erlon being in possession of La Haye Sainte, and the extreme right of Reille (Bachelu's division) in possession of the wood of Hougomont, left the space between La Haye Sainte and Hougomont unoccupied except by the cuirassiers who had supported the attack on La Haye Sainte.

Ney demanded troops to make good his line between these points, and Napoleon sent him the remainder of the cuirassiers of Milhaud. These troops, ranged behind the French right, had to cross the field of battle in order to take up a more forward position on the right of the French left. "I am going to attack, support me," ("*Je vais attaquer, soutiens moi*"), said

six. Independently of any reasons which may be adduced from the course of events, there are two witnesses in favour of this later hour, which lend it great probability, Major Baring, who was in command of the post, and General Heymès, the chief of Ney's staff.

To us it appears simply inconceivable that Ney should have been in possession of this important post, and been able not only to line the hedges on the ridge above it, but to bring two guns to the ridge so as to bear on the English centre—and it is admitted that he did this shortly after gaining possession of La Haye Sainte—and *not have been able to support his cavalry attack with infantry*.

There was undoubtedly a critical moment in the battle when the infantry forming the English left centre were hardly pressed—when almost the shadows of Alten's German and Lambert's English divisions were fighting against fearful odds, and were unable to charge and clear the ridge on account of the French cavalry supports. If La Haye Sainte were taken at *two, three, or four* o'clock, Ney, who was in want of infantry to support his great cavalry attack, must have made no use of the captured post for *five, four, or three* hours, a supposition which is inconceivable. If it were not taken till *six* o'clock, or some time after, the story of the battle becomes intelligible; for then it would not have been taken until the French cavalry had ceased to be a formidable engine of attack, although its remains collected in the hollow under the ridge of the plateau would be strong enough to support the infantry in, and in advance of the former.

General Milhaud to Lefebvre-Desnoëttes, who commanded the light cavalry of the guard, in front of which Milhaud had to pass in taking up his new position. Lefebvre-Desnoëttes took this *for an order from Napoleon*, and, following Milhaud, ranged himself behind him in support. This mistake, if it were one, occurred within 200 yards of La Belle Alliance, and was speedily rectifiable. That this movement, on the supposition that it was no part of his design, was not at once countermanded by Napoleon, must evidently be accounted for. Accordingly, M. Thiers despatches his idol to superintend the attack against the advancing Prussians. M. Thiers evidently does not perceive that these unrectified errors of subordinates are a part of the usual advantages of a flank attack, and that to distract the attention, or call off the person of the opposing general is an evidence of the success of better strategy—it is, in point of fact, the way in which most battles are won. The fact however is, that Napoleon never left his station in the neighbourhood of La Belle Alliance to watch or superintend the attack on the Prussians.

At the moment that Ney found all this magnificent cavalry at his disposition, Wellington called in a portion of his reserves, and withdrew his front line to shelter them from the French artillery, leaving nothing visible to Ney and the troops in the valley, but some sixty guns on the ridge of the plateau, apparently unsupported.

Ney (we are still giving M. Thiers's story), encouraged by his success at La Haye Sainte, irritated by the fire of the English artillery on his cavalry, and perceiving the guns to be apparently unsupported, put himself at the head of four regiments of cuirassiers, and ordering four others to follow in support, over-rode the guns, charged Alten's division, overthrew several Hanoverian and German battalions, trod them under foot, put them to the sword, and took their flags. "Our cuirassiers," says M. Thiers, "who were the oldest soldiers in the army, satiated their rage by killing the *English* without mercy." This attack was, however, borne back by the English cavalry. Whereupon Ney reformed his ranks, summoned Lefebvre-Desnoëttes into action, and repeated the assault with the light cavalry of the guard, whom he supported by the cuirassiers he had reformed. There is no indication in M. Thiers's narrative that this assault was repulsed, and the issue of an attempt to repel the attack by the English cavalry seems to have been that its *débris* were obliged to take refuge behind the squares. Ney, elated by his success, but apparently unable to make any serious impression on the Anglo-Allied line, now began to look around him for reinforcements. Casting his

eye over the field he perceived the cuirassiers of Kellerman, 3,000 horse, and the heavy cavalry of the guard, 2,000 horse. Napoleon placed the former at his disposal, observing, however, that the attack was made too early by an hour. Kellerman, in giving up his cavalry to Ney, mistrusting the success of the attempt about to be renewed, kept a brigade in reserve. But the ardour of Ney had communicated itself to every man in the French army, except the General-in-Chief, who, while he thought the movement premature, acknowledged the necessity of supporting it. With this additional force Ney renewed the attack; still failing to make any available impression on the English infantry,* seized the brigade which had been kept in reserve by Kellerman. These forces still proving insufficient, he met with the unlooked for aid of the heavy cavalry of the guard, who, sharing the general belief that all that remained to be done was to secure a victory already in effect achieved, appear to have joined in the *mêlée* without orders. Just previously to the arrival of this last reinforcement the Duke had decided to sacrifice the remains of his cavalry (!) which soon succumbed; "for," M. Thiers says, "if the English infantry could arrest our cuirassiers with the bayonet, no cavalry could support their formidable shock."†

Eleven times in all did Ney lead one body or another of this unrivalled cavalry to the charge, whilst four horses were killed under him, and the two armies admired his unsurpassed energy and heroism. But the French horse were matched by the British and Anglo-German infantry; and Ney at last perceived that without the effective support of infantry, the victory, which he had thought to be within his grasp, would yet escape him. He accordingly demanded of Napoleon the infantry of the Imperial Guard. ‡

* In this attack, according to M. Thiers, the 69th Regiment was "*haché en entier*." His accuracy of statement may fairly be judged by the fact that this regiment (represented by its second battalion) went into action 364 strong, and lost seven officers killed and wounded, and 79 rank and file killed, wounded, and missing. The 27th regiment, at a later period of the day, suffered infinitely more; but so far from being utterly destroyed, the gallant remnant—a mere skeleton—kept its place in the Allied line, participated in its triumphant advance, and bivouacked on the ground occupied in the morning by the French.

† It may, perhaps, be worth while to note here, as will be shortly seen, that the Duke had kept two brigades of three regiments each, of Light Horse, under Vivian and Vandeleur, in reserve, until the moment came to convert the repulse of the French army into the most signal and complete victory of modern times. It was this reserve of cavalry which, in fact, routed the French army.

‡ Ney had lost at this moment, says M. Thiers, four thousand of his horse, but "on the other hand, ten thousand English, horse or foot, paid

Napoleon's answer to Colonel Heymès, Ney's messenger, was characteristic, and well expressed the measure of the difficulty of the situation. "*De l'infanterie !*" said Napoleon, "*où veut-il que j'en prenne ? Veut-il que j'en fasse faire ? Voyez ce que j'ai sur les bras, et voyez ce qui me reste.*" ("Infantry ! where would he expect me to get it ? Would he have me make some for him ? See what I have on my hands, and see what I have left me.")

In fact, the diversion of Bulow had begun seriously to operate on the events of the day. From the heights above Planchenoit, Blücher had seen something of the unparalleled cavalry attack on the English position. He had accordingly hastened the pace of his troops ; and the guns which he had hurried to the front already began to tell on the French rear. The 7,500 infantry under Lobau, and the 2,500 cavalry under Domort, had been sensibly reduced in an heroic resistance to superior numbers. Planchenoit, a village in the French right rear was seriously threatened, and its occupation would have cut off Napoleon's line of retreat. He accordingly dispatched Duhesme with the Young Guard (eight battalions, and nearly 4,000 men) and twenty-four guns to occupy Planchenoit. Foiled in a first attempt to possess himself of this important position, Bulow succeeded in a second attempt. He held it, however, but for a very short time ; for two battalions * of the Old Guard, animated by the Emperor's exhortations, and clearly perceiving the danger they were called on to avert, cleared the village of the Prussians.

This incident, which M. Thiers designates as the complete defeat of the Prussians, must have occurred some time not much later than half-past seven o'clock. During the time between Ney's application for more infantry and this relief from the pressure of Bulow's attack, M. Thiers makes the battle with the Anglo-Allied army languish, but leaves Ney's cavalry and the infantry of D'Erlon, which had debouched from La Haye Sainte, in the possession of the ridge of the plateau. This is unsupported by any evidence, and whilst it is contrary to the best accounts given by French and English historians of the battle, is also in itself most highly improbable.

with their lives their obstinate resistance" ("*en revanche dix mille Anglais, fantassins ou cavaliers, ont payé de leur vie leur opiniâtre résistance*").

* It was, we believe, three battalions which accomplished this feat. M. Thiers says that the twenty-four battalions of the Guard had been reorganized into twenty-three, owing to the losses at the battle of Ligny. Napoleon states these losses at 100 men ; and although he is no very trustworthy authority for such a fact, it does not seem likely that any one division of the Guard lost men enough at Ligny to render any reorganization necessary.

Allowing 7,500 men for Lobau's infantry, 2,500 for Domont's cavalry, 4,000 men for the Young Guard, 1,000 men for the Old Guard, and 1,000 for the gunners employed against the Prussians, it will appear that this diversion relieved the Duke of 16,000 men. This is, no doubt, rather an overestimate, but the 56,000 left in front of Wellington were, taking into account the immense superiority of the French army in artillery, a fair match for the heterogeneous assemblage of 69,000 which he had to oppose to them. In these numbers no allowance is made on either side for the dead and wounded, nor for fugitives from the field. Taking all into account, it is to be feared—and the fact, while it greatly redounds to the honour of the Duke and the brave men around him, is a disgrace to the rest of the allied army—that at the moment at which we have now arrived, when Napoleon was about making his final attack, the number of combatants in face of each other were not very unequal.

The disposable troops of Wellington were, however, more numerous than those of Napoleon. The former had only to defend his position; the latter, whilst attacking Wellington's position, was obliged to keep some of his choicest troops in reserve. He was only able, in fact, out of the thirteen battalions of the Guard, according to M. Thiers, to direct four against the English right centre, which was to be attacked. These were led by Ney to the assault, whilst the six others were formed in squares of battalions diagonally between La Haye Sainte and Planchenoit. Three other battalions were left in charge of head quarters, or at the point at which the road to Planchenoit issues from the high road between Brussels and Charloir.

Few words will suffice for M. Thiers's account of the remainder of the battle. In this portion of his narrative he abdicates the character of the historian, and simply gives his countrymen the most agreeable account he can construct consistently with the fact that the battle was really lost, and that the Allies entered Paris within three weeks.

At the moment that he prepared this final attack, Napoleon, says M. Thiers, whose heart had been for an instant oppressed, again breathed, and counted again on victory. Whilst forming the columns of attack, however, he heard some firing in the direction of Papelotte. *It might be Grouchy.* But it might also be the Prussians. His uneasiness increased on seeing some of Dürutte's troops abandon Papelotte to the cry of "*Sauve qui peut!*" raised by treason.* Being rallied by

* In the account dictated by Napoleon at St. Helena to General Gourgaud

Napoleon, they returned to their post. But now the Emperor, looking towards the plateau, observed an unsteadiness amongst the troops, who, it will be remembered, had possession of the ridge. He sent La Bédoyère to spread the report that the troops coming into action on the French right were Grouchy's. He then gave Friant the command of the four battalions he had formed for the attack. Napoleon then meets Ney, who tells him that the troops on the plateau (not, be it observed, at Papelotte and La Haye) will give way unless instantly reinforced. Napoleon gives him the four battalions which he was sending forward under Friant. They ascend the plateau *en échelon*, left foremost. Assailed by grape-shot, the bearskin caps waver, but still advance. The attack is supported by two divisions (Foy's and Bachelu's) of Reille's corps, who withdraw from the advancing guard some portion of the fire. Having discharged their pieces, the guard prepares to charge, when, at a signal from the Duke, Maitland's guards rise from the ground, and deliver at point-blank a murderous volley. The guard does not recoil. Friant, badly wounded, descends the plateau, and, meeting Napoleon, tells him that with further reinforcements victory is certain.* Whilst he is listening to Friant he sees, towards Papelotte, the brigades of Vivian and Vandeleur, 3,000 strong, descending the declivity at the charge. The corps of Ziethen had arrived at Wellington's extreme left and relieved these squadrons. It was now eight o'clock. If the cavalry of the guard had been left to him, Napoleon might still have swept the field of Vivian and Vandeleur, have disengaged his left, and, withdrawing it upon his centre, have retired in good order by his right. But four hundred chasseurs of the guard are all that are left. He launches these against the English cavalry—at first with some success, but numbers carry the day. The field of battle is inundated with cavalry in English and Prussian uniforms. The battalions of the guard oppose an effectual obstacle to the disorder. Ziethen's infantry capture the farms of Papelotte and La Haye, and thus obtain possession of the apex of the right angle formed by the French line opposite Mont St. Jean

it is said that at this moment some of Durutte's troops actually retired, not to the cry of "*Sauve qui peut!*" but in good order. On being asked the reason of this movement, the troops answered that they had not been forced, but ordered, to retire. By the command of the Emperor, they returned to the post they had quitted. This is the only version of an incident thus misrepresented by M. Thiers.

* It was probably at this moment that the two great Captains, Wellington and Buonaparte, were nearer to each other than at any other moment of their lives.

and by the corps of Lobau.* The cuirassiers, who had retained possession of the ridge, seeing themselves surrounded, retire that they might not be cut off from the centre of the army. This retrograde movement down the slope soon becomes an impetuous torrent of men and horses, and the remains of the right wing become disbanded in rear of the cavalry.

We have now brought M. Thiers's narrative to the point at which the English general, "drunk with joy," advances, and at which "one hundred and fifty thousand" men, English and Prussians, rush on the *débris* of the French army. But it is not from the English and Prussians that the French fly; but, believing the report that Napoleon is dead or wounded, they think that there is nothing more left for them to do in the world.

It is difficult to conceive that, after the production of so many critical accounts of the battle by military men, some of whom had expended so much time, industry, and ingenuity in ascertaining and discussing its details, an author like M. Thiers—a distinguished writer; but a civilian—should have ventured on so original a narrative. That he should be ready to sacrifice his character with posterity as a historian to that popularity as a writer with his own countrymen now living which might serve his ends as a politician, is conceivable; but that in his own pages, and without troubling his readers to make further research, he should leave such striking evidences of haste and *animus* as we have already given, is remarkable. Surely it would have been wiser rather to have lost a little in melo-

* Much confusion and uncertainty has always attached to the possession of these farms. It seems certain that Papelotte was taken by Durutte rather early in the day, but immediately retaken. We are inclined to believe that it was not again occupied by the French. The uncertainty about La Haye should, we think, be certainly dissipated by the letter of Prince Bernhard of Saxe Weimar to his father. The Prince writes:—"My command was on the left wing, and I was charged to hold a village and a position: I succeeded, but with great loss. The victory was still doubtful, when about four o'clock" (nothing is more remarkable than the confusion with respect to time which reigns throughout all *original* accounts of this battle by those engaged in it), "the Prussians, under Bulow and Ziethen, arrived on our left flank, and decided the battle. Unhappily, the Prussians, who ought to have sustained me in my village, took my Nassauers, who still wear the blue uniform, though their hearts are thoroughly German, for Frenchmen, and opened a terrible fire on them. They were driven from their position, and I rallied them at a quarter of a league from the field of battle. My general of division, of which the first brigade was totally destroyed, is now with me." This is not an official despatch, but the letter of a son to a father. It was written on the 19th, and was finished just as the Prince received orders to march on Nivelles. It is evident that the Prince, shut up in La Haye, knew very little of what passed except on the spot he defended; but for what took place there he is a good witness.

dramatic effect than to have given certain definite numbers, for instance, for the army of Wellington and of the corps of Bulow, Ziethen, and Pirch, and, after killing them off wholesale, to have added fifteen thousand to their original number by the close of the battle. He might surely, too, have done better, if, desiring to magnify the military genius of Napoleon, he had omitted to impugn both the talents and the character of his antagonists.

By an ably combined movement of his scattered forces, Napoleon had assembled them within striking distance of the frontier on the evening of the 14th of June. This movement was masked by a triple line of fortresses, behind which lay the line of march. This concentration has always been admired by military critics, and M. Thiers's ecstatic laudation of this "*grande et merveilleuse opération*" is quite natural. We willingly forgive him any even unduly exaggerated praise of his hero. He is at liberty if he pleases to whine over the caprices of fortune, and to make the very most of the bad weather. But we cannot allow him to depreciate and to sneer at the strategy of the allied generals, by way of proving that all the reverses of the French arms were due to the inexorable hardness of fortune.

Napoleon's concentration of his troops on the evening of the 14th was indeed masterly, but was by no means so unknown to the Allies as M. Thiers pretends. The French general had masked the fires of his bivouacs behind rising grounds covered with forest; but the clouds played him false, and, by reflecting the glare of the long line of fire, revealed the presence of the French army to Ziethen. Blucher's arrangements were admirable, and if the orders he issued on the 14th and 15th had been fully understood and promptly carried out, the battle of Ligny would probably have terminated differently. As it was, Ziethen retired disputing every inch of ground with the French advance, and no part of his corps was ever in any danger, except the brigade of Steinmetz on his extreme right, which was at one moment in danger of being cut off by the rapid advance of Reille. By the evening of the 15th Blucher, whose head-quarters were at Sombref from the middle of the day, had collected 60,000 men in its immediate neighbourhood. At the same moment Napoleon had not half as many troops within striking distance of that point. M. Thiers pretends that Napoleon had fully expected these rapid and well-combined movements of the Prussian general, and he impertinently and unworthily attributes them purely to his promptitude as an hussar.

Wellington had not been as well advised of the movements

of the French as Blücher, Ziethen having failed to advise the English general of their actual advance in force on the morning of the 15th. That he was able to concentrate in time for the day of battle is proved by the event. That he might have fought at Waterloo with 17,000 more troops than he actually mustered on the field is also undeniable. That he did not bring up these troops is the only one fault attributed to him by Colonel Charras: this fault, says that very brilliant and learned critic, he nobly redeemed. But other writers, though not with the self-sufficient and positive air adopted by M. Thiers, attribute to him another fault; they say that his force was *trop à droite*. And so no doubt it was, if the only object were to meet a sudden attack on the centre, by offering battle on that point at the very opening of hostilities.

There can be no doubt that Wellington believed, and he continued in this belief to the end of his life, that Napoleon's best line of attack lay by the valley of the Scheldt and Lys, and that his attempt should have been to turn the English right, and to compel the Duke to fight at disadvantage for his line of communications with the sea. Very great advantages certainly flow from a successful attack on the centre of a long line of cantonments, and the disruption of communications so produced. But like many other very good things, it is attended with difficulties of execution; for it is obvious that concentration on the centre may be effected at just double the rate of concentration on either flank. Napoleon chose the more difficult task and failed; but he evidently thought the attack on the English right the next best plan, for he made demonstrations in that direction by way of feint. Wellington, then, was justified by the evidence of Napoleon's strategy in jealously guarding his right, and in forbearing to concentrate towards the real point of attack, where concentration was so much easier, until he had received trustworthy information as to which was Napoleon's real attack and which was his feint. Those who are familiar with the points of the campaign will at once perceive that, whatever might be its ultimate issue, a feint with 30,000 or 35,000 against Ziethen, and an attack by Napoleon in person with 90,000 or 85,000 on the English right, *could not* have resulted so badly for him as the plan he actually adopted.

The retention by the Duke of so large a force as 17,000 at Hal, whilst so great a general and so fine an army were before him, is hardly so fully explicable, without taking into account the character of the man as well as the genius of the general. The Duke thought that he had sufficient means in hand to bar Napoleon's way to Brussels until the arrival of

the Prussians should enable him to turn a *stand* into a *victory*. The accident of the fire at Wavre—the only real accident of the day—delayed their co-operation. Had it been so long delayed as to have enabled Napoleon to force the English position, the admirable judgment of the Duke in its selection would have been apparent, for the forest in his rear would have enabled him to make good use of the three open roads for retiring from the field long before Napoleon could have brought his artillery over the ridge. In fact, as the Duke was secure from being turned, the rout of his army by an attack in front was morally impossible; and a victory which would have left Napoleon master only of the field of battle, with the Duke before him or on his left, reinforced not only with the 17,000 men at Hal, but with the English troops from America, which joined him in the evening of the 18th, after the battle, and with an unbroken army of 90,000 Prussians in his rear or on his left, would have been one of those victories, the advantage of which is with the vanquished. Still when Napoleon at twelve o'clock was fully engaged on the Duke's front, his leaving so large a number of troops unoccupied on his right requires to be accounted for; and the reasons are partly due to the character of the man, and partly to the misleading account of the movements of the Prussians which reached him in the course of the day.

The Duke, from Assaye to Waterloo, had done great things with very moderate means. He had never experienced, until the evening of the 18th of June, an *embarras des richesses*. Whether his character were formed by circumstances, or whether he were originally made so, it is certain that he took a certain pride in proportioning his means to his end, and in husbanding his resources. He believed that he was strong enough on the 18th to defeat the French, and he would not give up the advantage of a nucleus of troops at Hal, which would enable him to check an attempt to turn his right, in order to make more certain that of which he was already sufficiently assured. The accounts which reached him of the arrival of Bulow's advance, were unaccompanied with any information of the retardation of his main body by the fire at Wavre. Thus the Duke was encouraged in his original conviction that, as in point of fact it turned out, his force was sufficient for his purpose; and his character, if we are right, disposed him to rest satisfied with what was sufficient. In a question of this kind, when it is absolutely impossible to recover *all* the facts, or to judge of *all* the reasons which induce a great general to adopt a certain course, great weight is due to *authority*. And, if we may accept any authority on a dark

point, we may surely accept that of the leader who never lost a battle, nor even a gun, and before whose genius the star of Napoleon's best marshals, and, at last, the star of the great captain himself, grew pale.

For some twenty years after the battle, Napoleon's theory of the campaign was pretty generally adopted. According to Napoleon, all the misfortunes of the French were due to errors of Ney and Grouchy, and to the weather, whilst the success of the allies was obtained by a sort of *flood*, and notwithstanding errors of judgment which should have left them at the mercy of Napoleon. That hero was dear to the liberal sect as the child of the revolution, and they forgave him his unfilial violence to his parent in consideration of the injury and disgrace he had inflicted on ancient crowns and time-honoured institutions. They could not well say that he won the battle of Waterloo, but they did say he ought to have won it; and the stories of the surprise of Wellington, and of his intended retreat, but for the circumstance that his ill-chosen position rendered retreat impossible, were perhaps more firmly believed than many sacred truths which do not wear quite so acceptable an aspect, or are devoid of the charm of detraction.

But the stories of St. Helena had their day, and next came the turn of the military historians and critics. Jomini, Charras, and Siborne collected and compared the facts, and educed from them a very different account of the campaign and of the battle. M. Thiers either has not read the works of these competent historians, or, having read them, has found them quite unusable. His idea was identical with Napoleon's, who is M. Thiers's, as he was his own idol. Accordingly M. Thiers has drawn all his inspirations from St. Helena.

But whilst we acknowledge the merit of such writers as those above named, and of the latest writers—M. Quinet and Mr. Hooper—who have written on the campaign, and who have given most interesting and readable narratives of it, we believe that its permanent history is yet to be written.

Not more than justice has been done to Wellington and Blücher, but the authors, who now recognise some of the causes of Napoleon's failure, do him less than justice in accounting for them. The authors we allude to see the well nigh insuperable difficulties with which Napoleon had to contend, but they do not give him credit for seeing them also, and so they lose the thought which dictated all his movements. He fought under the necessity of winning quickly, brilliantly, and decisively. If he did not obtain all this, it imported but little to save his army for a prolonged after campaign on the soil of France. He opened the campaign with the requisite

brilliancy, but at Ligny his plan essentially broke down. Perhaps he had somewhat overshot the mark, and commenced so brilliantly as to exhaust his troops. The delays of the next day were immaterial. From the evening of the 16th he acted as if he had completely defeated the Prussian army, or as if it were certain that, if not defeated, Blücher would not devise and execute a prompt concentration of his army with that of Wellington. After sending Grouchy to harass the retreat of the Prussians, Napoleon did not think it worth while to acquaint his lieutenant with the information obtained at head-quarters of the retreat of two divisions of the Prussian army by Tilly and Mont St. Guibert. He was right from his point of view. If the Prussians were not completely defeated, and if, not being defeated, they and Wellington did what they ought, the campaign and the throne of France were lost. Napoleon took the many chances that were in his favour, and acted as if the Prussian army had been hopelessly beaten, or as if, being still in fighting order, the two independent generals would not act together with harmony, unity, and precision. The chances were worth much, and there were no advantages, *from Napoleon's point of view*, in more careful generalship. We must make to this supposition what are apparently two exceptions, but which are perhaps but one. He should, on the hypothesis we put forth, have retained for himself the corps of Vandamme, and have occupied the defiles of the Lasne. This criticism is strongly supported by the belief of the Duke of Wellington that he had one corps more of the French army before him than was actually in the field. That is, he attributed to Napoleon, in the absence of exact information, a better division of his forces than he had in point of fact made. The origin of this error of Napoleon's was, no doubt, his firm conviction in the impossibility of such prompt and energetic action on the part of *two* generals with independent commands. And we must acknowledge that Napoleon was so far right in relying on this, that when Blücher and Wellington met at Rossomme they might well congratulate each other on an *unprecedented* success. The chances in Napoleon's favour may be in some measure estimated by two actual events:—The *first*, that, on the 15th, Ziethen failed to acquaint Wellington with the pronounced attack of the French; the *second*, that on the 18th he declined, late in the day, to expedite his advance to the English left, at the request of the Duke, lest one portion or another of his force should be compromised by their separation. We might adduce other instances amongst the events of the day which would go to show that Napoleon very

barely under-estimated the extreme improbability of unity of action on the part of the Allied commanders.

If we justify Napoleon for acting as if this extreme improbability were effective, it may be thought that we detract from the praise due to Wellington, who disregarded it. But it is not so; for the Duke knew two things which Napoleon did not. The Duke knew the state of the Prussian army, and that he and Blucher had agreed, as a matter of fact, to a plan which was practicable and certain to succeed if carried out.

Prussian writers have thought that English historians have hardly done justice to Blucher and his army, and so have—perhaps very naturally—magnified somewhat their share in this great victory. There was, however it may be divided, credit enough for all in this crowning struggle. If the Prussians should get all they claim, there would be enough left for Wellington and his brave companions in arms, and we are not disposed to reopen the discussion. The French—and certainly M. Thiers—have done the same thing; and most naturally also. For against Waterloo, in so far as it was a Prussian victory, they have some good sets off. Considered as an English victory, it adds another to the list in which are inscribed the famous names of Poitiers, Agincourt, Blenheim, and Vittoria. This is enough for England without Waterloo. Perhaps it would be better for the peace of the world if France could show something like a balance.

For England there is, perhaps, even too much of military glory in so many well-fought fields against the most warlike nation in Europe; and but for the justice due to the men who so bravely held the heights of Mont St. Jean, and to the great general who shared their endurance in the hour of danger, and infused into them his own calm confidence of victory, we could almost wish that the French and Prussian historians might have their way, and that *England's share in achieving the successful result* were less rather than greater than it was.

ART. VIII.—THE BELGIAN CONSTITUTION AND THE CHURCH.

*Assemblée Générale des Catholiques en Belgique. Première Session à Malines,
18-22 Août, 1863. Bruxelles. 1864.*

BELGIUM is a land of contradictions. It is at once a scandal to Christendom and an edification to the Catholic Church. It has a population but a little short of five millions, consisting almost exclusively of Catholics, yet this Christian population has a constitution which is godless in principle, and a Government which is irreligious in its acts.

The Belgian constitution dispenses with the public profession of belief in a God. Unlike even Pagan States, it recognizes no tutelary deity, but professes to regard all systems of religion with equal unconcern. Like Pagan Rome, which tolerated all worships but Christianity, the Indifferent State gives full liberty to all error, but is hostile to Catholicism. As a matter of financial administration, indeed, the Belgian Government distributes out of the public funds moneys in support of the teachers of all opinions alike; for even the ministers of the Anglican Establishment officiating in Belgium, though they and their religion are unknown to the country, are salaried by the State. The divine mission of the Catholic Church placed by God over the Belgian people has no more recognition from the State than the Anglican congregation or the Jewish synagogue. The divine laws, which are the foundation of all Christian society, are simply set aside. In a Catholic country the observance of Sunday is legally abolished; the sacrament of Matrimony, which has given a distinctive character to Christian society, and is the basis of the social edifice, is reduced to a mere civil contract, terminable under certain conditions; and further, the more effectually to efface the Christian character of society, God is banished from the higher schools of learning. The Belgian Government not only fosters, like a neighbouring state, the professors of Infidelity, but endows with public funds infidel universities.

The maimed faith which so large a proportion of the governing classes have not even the decency to hide, but which, on the contrary, they exhibit, as beggars do their sores, to every passer by, is clearly to be traced to the corrup-

tion their minds underwent in the godless universities of Catholic Belgium. In the whole country there is only one university to which Catholics can with safety resort, and this, to the credit of the people, but to the discredit of the Government, was founded and is supported alone by voluntary contributions. While the great Catholic university of Louvain has thus had to strike root and grow in a cold, ungenial clime, with the sole fostering aid of hardy and independent exertion, the free Masonic university of Brussels thrives under the light and warmth of Government patronage. The ministers of the civil power, the executors of the law, are all alike possessed by the godless spirit of the constitution, which again is reflected in the acts emanating from the Chambers, and in the outpourings of the public press, until in no country are the mysteries of the Catholic faith and the ministers of the altar so publicly assailed and so grossly misrepresented as in Belgium. In all its branches, and in its multiform encroaching developments, the State carries on an undying warfare against the Church and its institutions, monastic, educational, and charitable.

While the principles on which the Belgian Government is based, and the conduct which it pursues offend the reason, as much as they revolt the instincts, of Catholics, the Church in Belgium edifies all who are in the slightest degree familiar with its working, by its attachment to the Holy See, by the zeal of its clergy, and the religious and manly spirit of a large proportion of its laity. Since the year 1830, when it obtained its perfect freedom, the Church has created or revived innumerable institutions for the relief of the poor, the sick, and the aged, as well as for the education of the young. From the time that liberty of instruction was granted, elementary, Sunday, and training schools for trades have sprung up under the shadow of the Church on every side. The old monastic orders have been restored, and new orders introduced with an energy which commands our warmest admiration. The spirit of poverty, of severe self-denial, and of entire confidence in God prevails in a very high degree, both in the old and in the new orders. "Never, it may be said," observes a learned Belgian Jesuit, "has religious poverty been practised with more perfection than it has been in Belgium since 1830."* He also remarks that the community life and the renunciation of private property—a condition of things which Gregory XVI. and Pius IX. had striven with but partial success to introduce into the convents of Italy—exist

* P. V. de Buck, "*De l'Etat Religieux en Belgique au XIX. Siècle.*"

without an express order, and so much as a matter of course, in the Belgian convents, that a contrary system is never even contemplated as possible. This disciplined and courageous army of God, living under the rule of poverty and mortification, has no need to be stimulated to exertion; on the contrary, its charitable zeal in undertaking work upon work needs rather the restraining hand of prudence and discretion. The one office among them which is a sinecure is that of treasurer. They employ all their resources in opening fresh establishments, in building new churches, and in extending their labours of charity. They place their whole trust in God, relying implicitly on Him to help them through in their necessities. "It was a common saying, and continues to be so," says the learned writer whom we have just quoted, "that they have built on the security of Divine Providence." In no monastery, new or old, are candidates required to bring money with them; and even in convents of women little or none is necessary for the reception of postulants. This monastic spirit, this courageous trust in God, has brought its special blessing in the rapid increase of the religious orders in Belgium. In the year 1852 the members of the various communities were computed at twelve thousand. They are animated in a singular manner with a spirit of independence: the horror of Government interference or protection is almost universal. They desire to live under the shelter of the common law, and to enjoy no privileges and no exemptions.

On the Episcopate of Belgium it does not beseem us to pronounce a panegyric: we will only say that they are of one heart and of one mind with Rome. We cannot, however, refrain from offering our tribute of profound admiration to the character, the episcopal virtues, and learning of the late Bishop of Bruges, Monseigneur Malou, whose early death was truly a loss to the universal Church. To judge from the attacks which their zeal excites in the irreligious press, the Belgian clergy must be walking in the steps of their Divine Master. If not eminent for profound learning, they are conspicuous for the firmness of their faith, irreproachable in their morals, and devoted to pastoral work; although their duties, it may be observed, are not so onerous as those which fall to the lot of the Catholic priesthood in England. The Holy See has few more fervent defenders of its spiritual prerogatives and of its temporal rights than the Belgian clergy. In every town and in every village they gather round them the best and the boldest among the laity, and thus erect a firm rampart against the attacks of the infidel party and the encroachments of the State on their spiritual

rights. Such zealous Catholics are nicknamed "Clericals," and are bespattered with abuse by the press, by the Government officials, and by the Liberals in the Chambers. Among the working classes in some of the manufacturing towns irreligion prevails to a great extent. The lower order of shopkeepers, on the other hand, are for the most part good Catholics, and look to the guidance of their clergy. The strength of the infidel party lies in the trading and mercantile classes, and in the learned and literary professions. The large land-owners and the working population are, for the most part, devoted to the Church. But it is in the active and educated section of the Belgian people that the great antagonism appears which divides society into two hostile camps—the sons of the Church, and the worshippers of the State; the believers in Christ, and the professors of infidelity. This antagonism is so intense as to enter into every relation of life;* so public as to be the great and almost the sole distinction between political parties. What, then, is the cause of this hostility, so radical and unrelenting as to set mind against mind in the political, social, and religious life of a nation? There is no antagonism, be it remembered, here of races, nor of rival religions; no old-standing grievances nor hereditary wrongs, nor memories of bygone oppression; for the nation has only existed as an independent state for the third of a century, and since the introduction of Christianity the Church had never lost its hold upon the Belgic provinces. The cause is surely not to be sought in the ribald ravings of the infidel press, nor in the existence of Masonic lodges; for these are but the signs and symptoms of a deeply seated disease—the effects and not the causes of the evil. To us it appears clear that at least one, if not the chief, contributing cause to such a state of things in Belgium is the constitution of 1830.

It was an unfortunate period for the fabrication of an entirely new constitution. Revolutionary passions were at work. Catholic principles regarding the relations between Church and State had died out in the Catholic provinces of the Netherlands, or, rather, had been stamped out by the stupid tyranny of the Austrian rule. What the Church in Belgium had suffered under the Josephism of Austria, under the despotic rule of the first empire, and under Dutch William, was present to every eye in vivid and painful colours. No exaggeration was needed to enhance the servitude from which

* Some of the great hotels of Brussels, for instance, are known even to travellers as "Catholic" hotels and "infidel" hotels.

the Catholics of the two Flanders had but just escaped. Every monastery had its experience or its tradition to relate. The evils which had grown out of the old system were on every one's lips. Instead of remedying the abuses, the Belgians abolished the whole existing fabric. The dictum of Lamennais, that "kings are almost always enemies of the Church" would seem to have taken possession of the whole Belgian mind, for the Catholic theory as to the duty of an intimate union between the two powers entrusted by God with the government of the world, found no advocate in the National Assembly. And yet this union had in its favour not only Catholic usage, and the testimony of the most approved writers, but also the most express Pontifical declarations.

We cannot here enter into an examination of the principle which governs the relations between Church and State; it is a subject embracing so wide a range as to require a separate treatment. All we can do is to cite a few authorities on the necessity of the union between the two powers, before we proceed to examine the causes which led to the rejection of this Catholic principle by Belgium in 1830. Catholic teaching is ever explicit as to this necessity. "The union of the two powers," says Pope Innocent III.,* "secures their rights to the clergy and to the laity. Their separation, therefore, jeopardizes the rights of the Church, and weakens the authority of the civil power." S. Augustine teaches that "the civil power should promote good and prohibit evil, not only in matters appertaining to human society, but also in those appertaining to divine religion."† S. Peter Damian declares that both powers stand in need of each other; and that whilst the priesthood is protected by the guardianship of royalty, royalty finds its support in the sanctity of the priestly office.‡ "You know," writes Ivo of Chartres to Pope Paschal II., "that when royalty and the priesthood agree, the world is well governed, and the Church flourishes and bears fruit."§ But "when the bond of union is broken," says the learned writer || of the life of Pope Alexander III., "no peace can exist; then must the world be full of discord and of conflict."

* Innocent III. P. Epist. lib. ii. c. 294.

† Contra Crescon. iii. 51.

‡ Petri Damiani Epist. lib. iii. ep. 6, ad Annon. Archiep. Colon.

§ Ivo Carnut. Epist. 238, p. 103.—"Novit paternitas vestra quia cum Regnum et Sacerdotium inter se conveniunt, bene regitur mundus, floret et fructificat ecclesia."

|| Card. Arag., "Vita Alexandri III., P." Muratori Script. Rer. Ital. t. iii. col. 469.

That the civil power is charged with the duty so to govern mankind as best to conduce to their eternal welfare, and that for the efficient discharge of this paramount duty the closest union is necessary between the spiritual and temporal powers, are propositions which recur again and again in the decretals and epistles of the Popes, are repeated by doctors of the Church in every age, and are laid down as axioms by the best writers on canon law. As we cannot attempt to introduce here, or even to indicate the proofs to which we have alluded, we must content ourselves with a brief quotation from an epistle of Pope Leo the Great, as indicating the duty of the State towards the Church. "You ought to acknowledge without delay," writes Pope Leo to the emperor of the same name, "that the royal power is not committed to you merely for the government of the world, but chiefly for the protection of the Church; so that in putting down wicked attempts, you should defend things which are well ordered, and restore true peace where it has been disturbed."* In an epistle to the Emperor Marcian the same Pope says, "It is your duty to suppress every hostile movement against the Church."† It follows that the wicked attempts and the hostility of heretics, apostates, and others against the Church ought to be put down by the united action of the two powers. No Pope, no doctor of the Church, no authority of eminence, as far as we know, has ever supported the separation of Church and State in any degree. Their absolute separation, laid down as a formal proposition by Lamennais, was, as is well known, condemned by Gregory XVI. To propound such a theory in the manner he did was an excess of liberal audacity; to defend it in a less formal fashion, or on the plea of liberty even, is, if not so audacious, perhaps still more mischievous in its consequences.

To form a correct judgment, however, of the causes which precipitated Belgium into the stream of liberalism that flowed with such impetuous force during the revolutionary period of 1830, it is necessary to take a rapid glance at some of the leading features of its past history. Under Maria Theresa the Austrian Netherlands were prosperous and contented. Religion was held in honour, because for a brief period the civil power worked harmoniously with the Church in the furtherance of the public welfare. There was no conflict concerning jurisdiction, no attempt to wrest its prerogatives from the Church. And though Austria was a despotic state, its government had the good sense not to interfere with the

* Leon. M. Epist. 156, c. 3, ad Leon Aug. † *Ib.* iii. ad Marcian Imp.

liberties of its Belgic provinces. But this state of things was not destined to last long, for soon after his accession Joseph II. attacked the essential rights of the Church, and laid a heavy hand on the most cherished institutions of the people. By his decrees in 1781 he commanded the clergy to grant dispensations for marriage without any reference to the Holy See. In the year following decrees were issued commanding the celebration of marriages between Catholics and Protestants, in defiance of the canonical laws and of established customs. Soon some of the religious houses were abolished, and in others the rules of the order were interfered with, or altered by a simple proclamation. Such an abuse of the civil power was the prelude to still further violations of the rights of the Church. The episcopal seminaries, which, as a matter of right, were under the direction of bishops, were abolished, and in their stead universities of a character most offensive to the laity as well as to the clergy were established, and placed under the immediate jurisdiction of the emperor himself. This narrow-minded ruler busied himself with the minutest details as well as with the most important principles of Church government, so as to draw down upon himself Frederick II.'s sarcastic appellation of "my brother the Sacristan." The avowed aim of Joseph II. was to put aside the Papal authority throughout his vast dominions, and to set up his own arbitrary will in its stead. These despotic designs succeeded so well as to make his name and system a byword of reproach and abhorrence to after generations. Austria and Italy, and Belgium itself, to this day are suffering from the effects of his paltry and disgraceful system of government, and from the violent recoil against the principles inaugurated by his despotic rule. The political liberties and municipal rights of the Netherlands fared no better than the Church. His subjects rose in revolt, and the emperor, who died shortly afterwards, during the height of the great French revolution, declared that the revolt of the Netherlands had broken his heart. His successor strove in vain to stay the fury of the storm. The force of the revolution, which had its focus in Paris, carried everything before it; and whilst the scaffold was preparing for Louis XVI., the Austrian Netherlands were formally annexed to the French Republic, in the compulsory fashion so well imitated by Piedmont in our days. This incorporation was finally confirmed by the treaty of Campo Formio in 1797.

From that day Belgium ceased to be a Catholic State; the principles on which the civil power had rested were overthrown, and the theories of revolutionary France, the ideas

of 1789, took their place. For though miserably oppressed by the Emperor Joseph, and deprived of its inalienable right of self-government, the Church was still the Church of the State, and the canon law was the law of the land. But as Belgium had become an integral portion of the corrupt and godless republic of France, the Catholics of the annexed province had to submit to quite a new state of things, which, in order to avoid a greater evil, the Holy See was most reluctantly compelled to recognize in the Concordat of 1801. In this celebrated convention it is declared that "the government of the Republic recognizes the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion as the religion which is professed by the far greater number of the inhabitants of France." The first article enacts that "the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion shall be freely exercised in France; its worship shall be public, conformably to such police regulations as the government shall judge necessary for the public tranquillity." But that was all. A great triumph, indeed, when contrasted with the blasphemies and horrid profanities which had so lately shocked the moral sense of the world, and outraged the majesty of God; and yet what a falling off, and to the Belgian Catholics how grievous, when compared with the ancient rights of the Church, or with those even now secured to nations not more Catholic than themselves! In the first article, for instance, of the Spanish Concordat it is declared that "the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman religion which, to the exclusion of all other worship, continues to be the sole religion of the Spanish people, shall always be preserved in the states of his Catholic Majesty, together with all the rights and prerogatives which it ought to possess according to the laws of God and the enactments of the sacred canons." The Italian Concordat of 16th September, 1803, in the same manner declares that the Catholic religion continues to be the religion of the republic. What a degradation it must have been to such staunch upholders as the Belgians formerly were of the civil rights and position of the Church, to see its influence and dignity so lowered by the revolutionary law! How keenly they felt this treatment is evident from the resistance which, on being afterwards handed over to Holland, they offered to the constitution imposed upon their country by the arbitrary will of the king. For when the Assembly of Notables was convened for the purpose of ratifying this constitution, they rejected it by a considerable majority. The assembly had been fairly chosen, and its members, as was natural in so Catholic a country, were so much under the influence of Christian principles, as to oppose the introduction and licence of false religions in these Catholic

provinces. At the same time a collective protest of the Belgian bishops was presented against the toleration of false religions, under the title of "Doctrinal decision of the bishops of the kingdom of the Netherlands on the oath prescribed by the new constitution." This unanimous and solemn decision condemns the liberty given by the constitution to appoint persons of any or no religious creed to offices of trust and influence in an exclusively Catholic country; it reprobates, moreover, the enactment that the Catholic Church was to be subordinated to the State; that all religious sects were to be protected in their worship; that the government was to have the power to regulate all the seminaries of the kingdom; and that the liberty of the press was to be recognized. The episcopal declaration concluded with these weighty words:—"But when a human law is intrinsically bad, and opposed to the Divine law and to the laws of the Church, no one can, under any pretext, pledge himself (*s'engager*) to obey it." This protest was signed by all the prelates with the Archbishop of Malines at their head, and was accepted by the Notables, who had not yet become enamoured of the "modern liberties." They had not yet learned to make a boast of putting, in a Catholic land, all religions on an equal level. The theories as to the separation of Church and State had not yet been enunciated by the unfortunate Lamennais. And, more than all, the Belgians had not yet suffered under the Protestant King of Holland a renewed Josephism, the effect of which was to root almost entirely out of their hearts their ancient love and reverence for the political dignity and civil rights of the Church.

The spiritual and temporal governments [says a learned German historian] are both ever so linked together in their destiny, that whoever introduces discontent, or causes division and separation in the Church, does the same in the State; therefore let no prince bring things to such a pass that of him it may be said, as of Phaleg, that "in his days was the earth divided." On many occasions, and by many types, in the Old Testament, God [he adds] has especially shown how richly He rewards the kings who conscientiously preserve the bond of unity with the Church, but with what heavy chastisements He visits, on the contrary, those who have torn it asunder. It is therefore [he continues] a work of devilish malice to sow the seeds of distrust and of discord between the Church and the civil power; for exactly by these means mankind is cheated of its temporal and eternal happiness.*

William is the Phaleg of the Netherlands, and in him the idea of such a division took root. He, like Joseph of Austria, and so many other kings in the last and in the seventeenth

* Phillips, Kirchenrecht, Zweiter Band:—"Die Kirche und die menschliche Gesellschaft: Eintracht der beiden Gewalten,"

century, was the sower of the seeds of discord which have since borne such disastrous fruit.

In the midst of the national enthusiasm, of the popularity of the Prince of Orange, and of the military fervour which followed the victory of Waterloo, the Constitution, in spite of its informal character, as being rejected by the House of Notables, was promulgated. Under the circumstances of the moment all opposition was vain. Many refused, however, to take the oath to the Constitution; and some took it only conditionally, like Count de Mean, one of the bishops, who, on being nominated to a seat in the Council of State, refused to swear to the "tolerating constitution," as it was called, save with the reservation that, if the Pope should declare the oath to be contrary to the rights of the Church, it should thereby cease to be binding. No sooner, however, was the Constitution promulgated, than the king adopted a course of conduct which ended in completely alienating his Catholic subjects. He soon set to work to corrupt the Catholic education of his people by introducing German ideas, not only into the University of Liège, which he himself founded, but into those of Ghent and Louvain, where several of the chairs were occupied by Rationalistic professors from Germany. A still more audacious violation of the rights of the Church was a royal decree enacting that no priest should be inducted who had not, before his ordination, passed two years in the study of philosophy at the royal college of Louvain. For this purpose a college, denominated the Philosophic College, had been appropriated at the University of Louvain, under the direction of professors who were not only laymen, but some of them Protestants, and others German Rationalists. The very title of the college, borrowed as it was from Voltairian France, was offensive, and bespoke but too clearly its character. The Dutch Government finally established two seminaries in which it was enacted that all those destined for the priesthood should be educated. The Episcopal seminaries still continuing to receive candidates for Holy Orders were closed by force. For their opposition to such scandalous interference with episcopal rights in so grave a matter as the education of the clergy, the bishops were prosecuted. Under a law enacted by Napoleon, and still unrepealed, some of the bishops were condemned to banishment. Such conduct alone was enough to excite the indignation of the country. But, not content with these arbitrary and unjustifiable acts, and others of a like character, such as forbidding the Catholic youth to be educated out of the country, the king was so impolitic as to attack the devotional feelings of the people by the suppression of many of their

religious festivals. This blow was a home-thrust. The agitation spread and became absorbing.

A Concordat was entered into with Leo XII. in 1827, by which the Constitution, as having existed for so many years in spite of Catholic opposition, and for the avoidance of a greater evil, was at last recognized by Rome. Some ameliorations were introduced as to the religious government of the people; but these attempts at conciliation came too late. They failed to allay the popular agitation. The people, attacked in their civil as well as in their religious liberties, wounded in their national feelings by injudicious attempts to suppress their language, and in their self-respect by the promotion of Dutchmen to all the chief offices of trust and emolument, became thoroughly disaffected. The clergy demanded, not only the free exercise of religion, but the complete restoration of the rights and privileges of the Church, the prerogatives of the bishops, and the re-establishment of the old religious orders throughout the country. They pointed out, in memorials and in the press, that the duty of the State in relation to the Church was to protect religion and its ministers, to give legal force to the laws of the Church, and to punish external acts injurious to religion. The liberals in Belgium, the forefathers and founders of that school of liberalism and infidelity which now is in possession of the government and higher education of the country, joined the Catholic party, in the hope of being able, by its aid, to spread their own republican principles in the kingdom. Brussels was at that moment the hotbed of sedition. All that had in itself the germ of anarchy was attracted to its soil. Here were to be seen the infidel of the French republic, the exiled Napoleonist, visionary rationalists from Germany, expatriated Poles, scheming Italians, English and Irish Radicals, Freemasons, and Jews. Brussels was the revolutionary waste-pipe through which all the elements of European anarchy flowed. What wonder, then, that on the outbreak of the French revolution of 1830 barricades were raised in Brussels? The fight was prolonged; but at last, by the assistance of the arms of France, the revolution triumphed. But in the National Congress, composed of two hundred deputies, chosen in the several provinces by all the tax-paying population above twenty-five years of age, the demagogues of the revolution, the De Potters and men of his stamp, sank into insignificance. The Congress proclaimed the independence of Belgium and the perpetual exclusion of the house of Nassau. Monarchical government was resolved upon, and through the instrumentality of France and England, a Protestant prince was selected as king of Catholic Belgium.

Revolutionary France and English liberalism stood sponsors to the new kingdom, and introduced it into the European community. With the din of the barricades still in its ears, and the liberal ideas of the period in its mind, the National Assembly set to work to manufacture a Constitution.

This is the turning-point of Belgian history, which has already once before arrested our course. We hesitate to take the leap into the Belgian field of constitutional politics, where the wheat and the tares grow so luxuriantly together. Were we not averse to protesting overmuch, we should declare that we have as great an abhorrence of the arbitrary rule of Holland, and of the Josephism of Austria, as the Catholics of Belgium could have had; and that, to say the least, we love liberty as much as they. But the revolutionary spirit also inspires us with abhorrence in whatever form it displays or disguises itself; whether we meet with it in the unbridled anarchy of '89, or in the counsels of absolute monarchies during the last two centuries, or in democratic imperialism, or in the many unworthy compromises of Catholic principles to which this so-called liberal age has given birth. But it is not necessary to hold up to Belgium any mirror but its own history in the present century. For a second time in its brief eventful career Catholic Belgium had to consider the essential conditions on which its future government was to rest, but with this difference—that in 1814 it had to contend with Holland, to which it was annexed, and in 1830 it was completely its own master. How different was the spirit which animated the National Assembly of 1830 from that of the House of Notables in the former period. The latter rejected the Dutch constitution because it robbed the Church of its rights and of its civil authority; because in a Catholic country, though subject to a Protestant state, and united to a Protestant nation, it placed truth on the same level with error. And how different, too, were the principles enunciated so glibly in the national Congress, as to the legal position of the Church, from those which were laid down with such marked distinctness in the episcopal declarations of 1814! And when, in spite of the national vote and the episcopal protest, the "tolerating constitution" was forced upon the people, what conscientious scruples arose as to the lawfulness of taking the oath of fidelity! But to come to later days, to the time just previous to Belgium's emancipation from Holland, how far short of, or, rather, how antagonistic to, the demands then made by the Catholic clergy for the re-establishment of all the ancient prerogatives of the Church, was the actual position accorded to it by the constitution of 1830! For that con-

stitution simply stripped the Church of its royal garment, and sent it out into the nation publicly dishonoured. Far from being associated with the civil power in the framing of the fundamental laws which were to govern a Catholic people, the Church had to witness even the legal abolition of such divine precepts as the observance of the Sunday. All religions were, indeed, declared to be free. All opinions might legally be taught; but the State itself had no religious character whatsoever. The seal of God was not set to the constitution. So public a negation of the divine laws and of the divine government could not but bring about a profound demoralization. For there can be no question that the fundamental laws of a country and the constitution of its government have a most powerful and permanent effect in the formation of the character of a people. The institutions founded by the State partake also of its neutral character. The State universities in Belgium are, therefore, neutral in their teaching; and neutrality in matters of religion soon becomes open infidelity. The marriage laws have no religious character; and the law of divorce, which was struck out of the Code Napoléon, in France, in 1816, and has never since reappeared, remains in force in Catholic Belgium. The literature, too, which springs up under the influence and patronage of a State severed from religion, is, from its nature, profoundly hostile to the dogmas of Catholicity and to the government of the Church. What a wide field of corrupting influence is thus prepared for a nation! In truth, the Belgian constitution is in one respect even worse than the Concordat of 1801, which was forced upon the Holy See by the violence of Napoleon and the necessities of France; for therein the vast majority of Frenchmen are at least recognized by the civil power as belonging to the Catholic Church; whereas in Belgium the Catholic Church is put on no higher footing than that of a legal association, like all other religious—or, indeed, irreligious—societies in the country. What a contrast does the profound pain and the extreme reluctance with which Pius VII. accorded to France this, under the circumstances, necessary Concordat, present to the free and easy way in which the Belgian congress disposed of all the ancient rights and privileges of the Church, and, above all, of the civil position to which it was in every way entitled in Belgium. In his recent memoirs, Cardinal Consalvi shows what importance the Holy See attaches to the recognition of the Church by the State, and describes the strenuous and prolonged efforts that were made by Pius VII. to have the Catholic religion declared in the Concordat the religion of the State.

The clause, as it stands, was accepted only in order to save religion in France from total extinction. No priest, be it remembered, dared show himself openly in the country; the churches had been all desecrated to profane purposes; and the Pope was informed that the ideas of men had undergone such a change as not to tolerate even the semblance of "foreign domination." And, finally, Napoleon threatened, if the Concordat was not accepted, not only to march an army on Rome, but, like Henry VIII., to found a new religion in France. He publicly declared to Cardinal Consalvi that sooner than abandon one line, one syllable, of the Concordat, he would set up a schism in France, and drag half Europe into it. However, in spite of these threats, Pius VII. obliged this self-willed tyrant to give way on certain points which the Pontiff judged to be essential; but still, even as it was ultimately arranged, the Concordat was granted only because of an imperious necessity. Concerning one provision, which stipulated the extinction of the ancient sees in France, the Holy Pontiff exclaimed, "We will go, indeed, even to the gates of hell, but we intend to go no further." No words can express what it cost the Holy See, after long deliberation, to give its formal assent to the relinquishment of the public rights of the Church. Nothing, perhaps, more clearly shows the practical sagacity of the Holy See than its knowing how and when to choose the lesser of two evils. In this instance the Concordat was the lesser evil; for the Concordat was the salvation of religion in France. But no such reluctance, no such difficulty as was felt by Rome in assenting to the divorce of the Church from the civil power, was manifest in the congress of Belgium. In an assembly composed for the most part of Catholics, and in which sat thirteen priests, a constitution was adopted, without a protest as far as we know, more godless in its basis and in its character than that which was created by Napoleon for Voltairian France.

We will now inquire what were the exceptional circumstances in Belgium so grave as to warrant such a departure from Catholic principles and from established practice. For in no country in Europe is the religion of the people so utterly deprived of public honour, so entirely separated from the State, as in Belgium. Even one of its most strenuous defenders acknowledged at Malines that the constitution was a compromise springing out of the necessities of the times; but it seems far more like a compromise of Catholic principles in deference to liberal ideas. The unfortunate theories of Lamennais, then still uncondemned, were current in Belgium.

His impassioned appeals to the French clergy to march out of their gilded State churches and build willow tents in the fields—to exchange their miserable pittance and their alliance with the State for voluntary offerings and a closer union with the people—reacted on the Belgian priesthood. His illusive notions of exaggerated liberty, his democratic theories, his extravagant hopes and promises, had a fascination for the young politicians of Belgium. That “kings are almost always the enemies of the Church” was a maxim which appears to have had no little influence in the framing of the laws of their constitution. What seems to us a miserable sacrifice of principle was regarded as the crowning triumph of liberty. It was the beginning of an era of perpetual peace. The great bone of contention was removed by the retirement of religion into private life. Its sacred privacy should never henceforth be disturbed. What should divide liberals now from Catholics? Belgium should exhibit to the world an example of concord and brotherly love. The Jewish synagogue, the masonic lodge, and the Catholic Church were private societies; and as long as they did not violate the law in the use of their liberties, they might act as they chose and give offence to none. The cheap applause which such a sacrifice of the dignity and of the rights of the Catholic Church to what is called the “spirit of the age,” drew down from the liberals of Europe—how long did it last and what was it worth? What became of the promised peace, and of the respect for the mysteries of religion and for the character of its ministers, which was to follow from the withdrawal of the Church from public life? In a few years this unstable edifice of hope and promise, inaugurated with magniloquent phrases, crumbled into dust. On its ruins have arisen discord and bitter contention in public and private life. The irreligious press is notorious for its venomous slander and abuse of all that is holy and sacred in religion and in its ministry, and for gross and persistent misrepresentation of the truth. The Catholic religion and its dogmas are, to say the least, the subject of attack in the political arena, quite as much as if the Church occupied in regard to the State the position to which it is entitled. It has all the disadvantages of a public position, without the corresponding benefits.

Another of the practical evils which has resulted from the Belgian constitution, is a chronic state of hostility between the Church and the Government. The civil power has come to be looked upon as the natural enemy of good Catholics. It excites no sympathy, it commands no respect. It is a thing apart from the religious life of the nation. The Church,

regards it as an insidious—if not its sworn—opponent, ever on the watch to subvert its liberties, invade its rights, and counteract its teaching. The civil power, for its part, ostracizes the Church, brands its supporters with opprobrious names, and introduces penal measures to stifle its voice. It does more. It seizes every opportunity to desecrate the sanctuaries of the Church, by burying the unbaptized and the unbeliever* in consecrated ground, the ceremony being accompanied with blasphemous and atheistical declarations. It confiscates the endowments of the Catholic university, and appropriates by its mortmain laws the fruits of Catholic charity to its own uses.

All Catholic writers, however, are agreed on the necessity of harmony between the two powers which govern the world. The modern liberal school contends that this harmony is best produced by such a separation as exists in the model constitution of Belgium. It has tried the experiment there under the most favourable circumstances, and has most signally failed. For the hostility which divides the spiritual and temporal powers lies across the face of the country, and is written on the hearts of the people in characters so legible as to be mistaken by none. In his speech at Malines, M. de Montalembert himself acknowledged that the country was divided into two camps; and that the government by party-spirit had taken the place of the union of interests and of different opinions which in 1830 had regenerated the Belgian nationality. He further describes this intolerant party as having for a long time too successfully falsified the spirit of the Constitution; as having deeply entered into the national mind; and as having perverted and depreciated representative Government. Just so; the Belgian constitution, which has

* *Journal de Bruxelles*, 1864, *passim*. There is no grievance more frequently or more deeply complained of than the violation of the Catholic cemeteries by the civil powers. Mayors assume the right of judging whether or no a man has justly been refused the last sacraments by the Church, and thus forfeited his right to Christian burial. According to such decisions, infidels dying unrepentant have been buried, in spite of the clergy, in consecrated ground. An association, styled that of the *Solidaires*, exists, as is well known, in Belgium, the members of which bind themselves by oath to live and die without the sacraments. In the *Indépendance Belge* of November 10th, there is a protest on the part of the parish priest, the Rev. T. J. Renders, against the unjustifiable and violent conduct of the Mayor of Uccle towards the Church authorities in regard to the use of cemeteries; and from the *Monde* of November 25th, we learn that M. Van Bourmel, professor at the Government University of Brussels, and one of its chief promoters, having recently lost his wife, gave notice in the public papers that she would be buried by the committee of the *Solidaires*.

put the Church completely on one side, has left the field open to the civil power, which has availed itself only too readily of its opportunities. Unguided by the presence, unchecked by the control of the Church, the State absorbs into itself powers and influences foreign to its functions. It encroaches and invades, it grows and swells in its proportions, until it becomes the one power, the sole influence in the land. It aims at being supreme over body and soul. It seeks to subject to its direction the mind and conscience of the people. The state first banishes and then usurps the functions of the Church; it cannot be otherwise in the nature of things. Men, like the champion of Catholic liberalism at Malines, may protest against the strain put upon the Constitution by their more logical fellow-liberals; but is not such a straining the natural result of so one-sided a Constitution? For what is the negation of the Church but a political rationalism, which finds its philosophical counterpart in the denial of revelation; and when have we ever found that political or philosophical rationalists stop short of any measures to attain their ends? It was to be foreseen, therefore, that the rationalistic constitution would, from its nature, be strained or perverted to effect the overthrow of religion. The vice lies in the Constitution itself, which tends to create a rationalistic liberalism.

As to this destructive character of liberalism the Rev. P. Dechamps* bore witness at Malines; he declared that wherever the liberals were completely masters, they would legally shut the mouths of Catholics, legally break their pens, legally bind their hands; and that where they were only half-masters, they would do these things by halves; promising themselves, however, to do them completely as soon as they should have the power. He adds, moreover, that these liberals are sustained by all the power of the State.

What, then, becomes of those high-sounding sophistries in which our Catholic liberals indulge at the expense of political sagacity? What can M. Dechamps himself say of that maxim which the great orator repeated as one of profound wisdom, "Give liberty there where you are masters, so that it may be given unto you there where you are slaves?" The Catholic Assembly of 1850 surrendered the rights and privileges of the Church when they were masters, and M. Dechamps has told the Belgian Catholics that as soon as the liberals are masters they will make their Catholic brethren slaves; that they are already doing it as much as they can in Belgium; and that where they are completely masters they

* R. P. Dechamps, "La Cause Catholique."

bind Catholics hand and foot and gag their mouths. Such *ad captandum* arguments as are used by M. de Montalembert in support of universal toleration and of the perfect equality of all systems of religion, as well as that for the surrender of the exclusive rights of the Church where they may be justly put in force, may catch, indeed, the momentary approbation of ill-judging or inexperienced politicians, but fall at once to the ground before the inexorable testimony of facts. For Catholics to aim at beating the liberals by using their weapons, is labour lost: it is worse, it is a lowering of their colours. In speaking of such well-intentioned Catholics whom it calls diplomatic, political, or utilitarian Catholics, the *Civiltà Cattolica*, in one of its recent numbers, says:—

The Freemasons talk of liberty and toleration, and, behold, certain Catholics join the chorus, and themselves also boast of liberty and toleration. The Freemasons never cease declaiming about the great principles of '89, and the wonderful progress and the imprescriptible rights of modern society. And, again, our Catholics, with the best intention in the world, clamour even louder than the liberals in favour of the principles of '89, and exalt the glories of progress and of modern society. The liberals blame the middle age, and these hasten to do so also. They curse the Inquisition, and these instantly set to cursing it also. The liberals advocate the separation of the State from the Church, and these Catholics at once begin approving and applauding it. The liberals flatter the people, but these Catholics are ready to outdo them in flattery.*

The *Civiltà* adds what all know so well who have noted the praise which has been lavished on the recent conduct of certain great Catholic liberals in France and Germany, that "the liberals are very glad to see Catholics join their chorus in praising the evil and blaming the good." It is to be feared that such a tampering with the principles of '89, and with the theories current in 1830, has had much to do with the increase of liberalism in Belgium. For, in spite of the Free Church and its noble army of priests and its glorious monastic orders—in spite of the active and generous exertions, intellectual, social, and religious, of Catholic laymen, trained in the University of Louvain—rationalistic liberalism has made great advances and gained upon the educated classes of the country. The stuff out of which it was formed was slowly generated; in the first instance, under the absolutism of Spain and the Josephism of Austria, principles which in their turn owe their birth to the Reformation of the 16th century. It was quickened into life by the advent of the French Revolution;

* *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 15 October, 1864:—"La reazione clericale in Italia."

and it took a tangible shape under William of Nassau. And, finally, rationalistic liberalism owes its present development in a great degree to a constitution which has permitted a Masonic Government to educate a whole generation of men in godless and infidel Universities. By far the larger proportion of the governing classes has been brought up at Ghent and Liège, or at the free Masonic University of Brussels. Deeply imbued with the principles current at these notorious seats of learning and of infidelity, the students propagate their views throughout the country. The godless character impressed by the Constitution on the Government sanctions and furthers the spread of indifferentism and of unbelief. The whole class of Government officials, from the highest to the lowest rank, in every department of the State, in every province, and almost in every city, is infected with the same spirit which characterises the Constitution. Again, the general impression produced almost imperceptibly by such a state of things on the national mind is highly prejudicial to the preservation of the Christian character.

Such, then, is the effect of that constitution which M. de Montalembert held up at Malines to the admiration, not of Liberals who believe in nothing but their own excellence, but of Catholics who believe in the Divine government of society. In his view, and in that of his school, which, as we have seen, is not that of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, this godless constitution is held up "as glorious, as the best, or certainly the least imperfect, of all those that exist on the continent of Europe."* By the Belgian constitution perfect liberty is granted to the Church, an incalculable boon indeed in itself; but the Church has rights and duties conferred upon it by God, which are not to be sacrificed to liberty. It has the right to require from the State the public observance and the civil enforcement of the Divine laws; and it owes a duty to the civil power—the important duty of co-operation in the government of a Christian people. Rather than sacrifice such a right and such a duty, it were better for the Church, if need be, to suffer the loss of some of her liberties, however dear they be in themselves.

There is, it appears to us, but one excuse possible for the sacrifice in a Catholic country of all the royal rights and public duties of the Church, and that is the plea of necessity. In the Concordat of 1801 we have the measure of such a justifiable necessity; but apply this measure to the state of things existing

* M. de Montalembert, "L'Église libre dans l'État libre."

in Belgium in 1830, and it will be seen that its political or religious necessities were by no means such as to warrant so grave a surrender of Catholic rights and duties. It is difficult to conceive a greater difference than that between France in 1801 and Belgium in 1830. What France was after its demoniacal possession of 1792, is too well known to need a remark further than that the concessions of the Concordat were made for the salvation of religion in that country. But religion in Belgium in 1830 was an active and dominant principle; the clergy were a powerful body; and Catholics were the leaders in the movement which threw off the Dutch yoke, because, among other causes, it had deprived the Church of its ancient rights. The grave necessities, therefore, which warranted the concessions of the Concordat of 1801, were not present in Belgium to such extent as to justify the surrender of Catholic rights as made in the Constitution of 1830. There is a vast distinction, however, between the modification or compulsory surrender of a Catholic principle and its voluntary abandonment. The one is a work of necessity, albeit a matter of the deepest regret; but the voluntary abandonment is held up, on the contrary, by the propounders of that principle as an example, or made a boast of as a contribution to the liberty and the glory of the age, or as the promised beginning of a new and higher order of things in a coming era of unrestricted liberty. There is a third condition, viz., the existence of rights which have grown out of the abandonment of a Divine law. These rights have a claim to be observed; and in the same manner, in its degree, the existing Belgian constitution has a claim to be observed. Catholics have had to accept it, and live under it, and make the best of it, from the day of its promulgation until now—not for its own sake, but for the rights which have grown out of it, or are involved in it.

The Catholic Church has made the best of it. It has condemned the Masonic universities, patronized by the State, and has created a university of its own, in which the religious principle has its full weight and authority. The clergy do their best to uphold the rights of God set aside by the fundamental laws of the State. They enforce, as far as in them lies, the observance of the Sunday; they tolerate *selling* on the part of Catholics under the plea of a grievous necessity which is beyond their control; but they prohibit *buying*, as being a voluntary violation of the laws of the Church. Catholicism, with its monastic orders, its public institutions, its literature, and its congresses, in which the religious character is sharply and boldly marked, as it were, by way

of contrast, aims at creating a public opinion proof against that spirit of indifference and unbelief which issues with such terrible force from the State organisation. To hold its own, Catholicism descends into the political arena, and does battle on the hustings. The contest is not so much political as religious. It has been worsted in the recent elections; but defeat only shows the necessity of unflagging efforts against infidelity dominant in high places. The religious and the irreligious principle, embodied respectively in the Church and in the State, are brought face to face and meet in a life and death struggle. But so, we contend, it must always be in a State separated from the Church. The State will not long retain a neutral character; it becomes an open and a deadly enemy of the Church. A famous German publicist, who for a long period enlightened and led the mind of Catholic Germany, and whose political philosophy was as profound and as religious as that of the apostles of the free Church in the free State is shallow and irreligious, lays down the following propositions:—"A negative or indifferent position," he says, "of the civil power towards truth, or what is the same, towards the Church, is a criminal absurdity. The absolute separation of Church and State is, indeed, a real degradation and disgrace, amounting to the moral death of the civil power; the unlimited freedom of all possible and imaginable religions, and the placing them on an equal footing, is an anarchical dissolution of the deepest organic life of a State."* Traces of such a moral death may perhaps already be detected in the connection of the civil power in Belgium with anarchical, immoral, and blasphemous societies; in the patronage which it bestows upon them, and in the support which, as we have seen, it receives at their hands. The character of public life at all events is degraded by such a community of interests.

Few, we should hope, can approve abstractedly of the absence of the religious principle, which is the vice that lies at the root of the Belgian constitution, and which, in the short period of one generation, has contributed so much to the destruction of the exclusively Christian character of society. Between those who, in pursuit of illusive theories, sacrifice the religious principle at the shrine of liberty and those who hold to the religious principle as the essential condition of all organized societies, there can be little in common as far as political life is concerned. Such a divergence of principles ought to

* "Die Katholische Kirche und die Demokratie." Historisch-Politische Blätter. G. Phillips und G. Görres. Zweiter Band. München. 1838.

be openly stated and fairly canvassed. We have nothing, then, in common with the symbol enunciated by M. de Montalembert, and fitting so easily into the mouth of Cavour, of a free Church in a free State. If it be interpreted as meaning a Church and State free from the bonds of mutual support and of mutual dependence; if it means a State free from the control of the Church, or the Church free from—in other words, deprived of—its just and royal prerogatives; if it means the absence of all co-operation, and of all close union between the two powers which God has appointed to govern the world:—if it means all this, we utterly reject such a symbol as insufficient for the interests of society, and as repugnant to Catholic principles. Such a symbol is not a *beau idéal* to be held up for imitation in any age; it is, at the best, a miserable makeshift. It has a dubious sound, and is capable of a various interpretation, and that alone would condemn it as the expression of a political creed. We are content with the old creed; the age, if possible, must be brought round to its maxims, but the creed must not be altered to suit the spirit of the age. To those who are uneasily casting about for new formulas and for new principles on which to found a separation between Church and State, may it not be wisely said, "What God has joined together let no man put asunder?"

ART. IX.—CARDINAL WISEMAN'S SERMONS.

Sermons on our Lord Jesus Christ and on His Blessed Mother. By His Eminence CARDINAL WISEMAN. Duffy: Dublin and London.

Sermons on Moral Subjects. By His Eminence CARDINAL WISEMAN. Duffy: Dublin and London.

IN our July number of last year we briefly noticed the first volume of these sermons by His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman. Want of space compelled us then to do so too briefly. The second volume lately published by His Eminence forms a very fitting appendix or complement to the first, and we purpose to attempt a more adequate notice of both. The first volume bears the appropriate title of "*Sermons on our Lord and His Blessed Mother*," and are worthy of the name. They are full of the peculiar beauty which is to be found in minds illuminated from their earliest consciousness with Catholic faith; and trained to contemplate the Heavenly Court, the Person, and the Kingdom of our Divine Master.

The second volume is "*On Moral Subjects*," such as "*On the Love of the World*," "*Difficulty of Salvation of the Rich*,"

"On Unworthy Communion," "On Delay of Repentance," "On the Hatefulness of Sin," "On the Love of our Neighbour," "On Fickleness and its Remedy," &c.

These sermons are written in a very pure, calm, and vigorous English. There is about them a depth of patient and careful thought, a calm piety, and a profuse knowledge of Holy Scripture. They are evidently the work of a deep and cultivated mind in the period of life when, as yet, labour and toil have not come in to distract and to exhaust its powers. The minuteness with which the trains of thought are pursued, and the lesser features of the subject are traced out, touched, and retouched, show a sustained habit of reflection, and no common insight into the minds and dangers of other men. Some of them strike us as highly subjective: a quality of the first importance in a preacher, who, by the study of himself, delineates to others their own unspoken consciousness. Probably the sermons which do most in moving and moulding the hearts of other men, are precisely those which are the closest transcript of the preacher's own experience. We can imagine the years of solitary study, and still more solitary meditation in the corridors, the garden, and the chapel of the venerable English College in Rome, of which these sermons are the secret record. It is not for us to intrude into the penetralia, but we can imagine also that to the Eminent writer of these discourses they must recall the time, place, and occasions where they were composed, with the vividness of an autobiography. Perhaps nothing brings back to our minds in so fresh and lively a way the passages and seasons of our past lives, as writings in which we were uttering, unknown to other men, the deeper thoughts and trials of our own hearts. And yet this does not imply that the writer or preacher should ever introduce the mention of himself. He writes and speaks as the great type of all preachers, the *Vox clamantis in deserto*, impersonal, self-forgetting, absorbed in his message to mankind, penetrated with a zeal for souls. Nevertheless the characters which the Spirit of God has written on his own inward life, when transferred to his pages, or uttered by his lips, are legible and intelligible to other men, and are interpretations of their own consciousness, and the utterance of what they would speak if they could. This practical quality pervades the volume before us; and, we think, will render it most useful and acceptable.

In a preface prefixed to the first volume, and referred to in the second, the Cardinal tells us that most of these sermons were preached in Rome. They must, therefore, be referred to a period before the year 1838, while His Eminence was

Rector of the English College. There is something very simple and beautiful in the filial spirit which runs through the following passages, and in the humility with which he speaks of himself:—

It was in the year 1827 that the author received a commission from the holy and zealous Pontiff, Leo XII., to preach in Rome on the Sundays from Advent to Easter, the season during which foreigners crowd the Eternal City. So honourable but unexpected a commission, or rather command, could not be refused, even at the expense of much toil and confusion. Unskilled and inexperienced, the author was obliged to feel his way, and measure his steps slowly and painfully.—(Preface, p. iv.)

The audience which he had to address was so peculiar as to affect, no doubt, the character of his sermons. It was not merely what is called a mixed one. It was clearly divisible into two most distinct elements. The ecclesiastical comprised all the religious communities and colleges speaking English in Rome; theological students, and even professors, aged and venerable superiors of monasteries, with their novices and scholastics; and many other priests resident by choice, or for business, in Rome. And seldom is that city without some bishop, from either side of the Atlantic, or from some colonial see. The secular portion of the audience was composed of Catholic sojourners in Rome, and of no small proportion of Protestants, who were pleased to attend.—(Preface, p. v.)

We will now give a few extracts from the volumes; but no extracts will adequately convey either the beauty of the first, or the minute moral thoughtfulness of the second.

The first is from a Sermon on Devotion to the Blessed Virgin:—

You come and tell me that it is folly to think more of them [the Saints], that they are dead, and for ever gone, whose bones are crumbled to dust, whose souls have forgotten men. And I ask in return, Is it your opinion that heaven is a place in which, whatever is honourable to man, whatever is most precious to his soul, whatever is most beautiful in his nature, after the corruption of sin has defiled it, that love, in short, which is the very nature of God, is a thing not only unknown there, but banished thence and never to be admitted? Tell me, then, that you consider heaven to be a place in which the soul is to be employed for eternity in looking or diving into the unfathomable abyss of love which God is, and seeing that that love is a love not merely sleeping and inactive, but exercising itself in ten thousand ways, with all the resources of infinite power; and yet believe that in that ocean you must not love what God loves—(p. 297).

And now you will understand that there must be a scale of love. . . And the rule is one simple and obvious enough to all who have ever considered the prerogatives of God's saints. We honour them, we esteem them, we love them, we believe them to have influence, in proportion as they are nearer to

God. The martyr who has done the utmost that man can do, who, by giving his life for Christ, has shown the greatest love that man can bear, must be placed far above those who have not attained this privilege, and who consequently plead not that same intensity of love. The apostles, who were the immediate followers and companions of the Son of God in life, whom He chose to be with Him in His trials, to whom He committed His full power on earth, who, in addition to martyrdom like others, had also the glory of being His messengers over the whole world—they are naturally placed in a higher sphere, nearer the throne of God, more closely approaching Him, more vividly beholding Him, enjoying greater familiarity and more intimate union with the affections of their divine Master. Then what shall we say of her whom God chose to adhere in every time and place to the Redeemer of the world, His own Word incarnate ; so that never for a moment was she allowed to be willingly separated from Him. . . . If the closeness with which any one was privileged to stand by our Lord on earth is the criterion of the place occupied in heaven, and of the prerogatives there granted, who can doubt that she, the most blessed Virgin Mary, has a place in the court of her Son, such as is granted to none other ?—(pp. 299, 300).

Another beautiful passage is found in the Sermon on the Veneration of the Blessed Virgin :—

Our blessed Redeemer is the real Sun of justice, who alone can shine on our hearts with that saving power and grace, through which alone we can attain our reward ; and it is only He, that brilliant Sun in the firmament of heaven and the Church, who can enlighten our faith, warm our hope, and enkindle our charity ; for from Him alone comes grace, from Him alone is light, from Him alone is life. But tell me, is it less that same Sun, or is He less to you when, instead of being viewed directly in all His dazzling brilliancy, He comes on you mellowed, as it were, through the storied window, bearing imprinted on His own rays the effigies of saints and angels who would have no existence there but for His light ; for all was dark, shapeless, colourless, until His rays came ; and then on a sudden He gave them light and colour, and He shaped them into form, and He softened His own radiance as He shone through them ; but without Him they had no existence. And so the Church contemplates through the saints the glory of the Son of God. In their own nature they were sinful, frail, and helpless ; but they have been the medium through which the rays of divine grace have passed, and as they so shone, they have had their brilliancy made enduring—(p. 304).

The contemplation of the glory of the saints and of their dignity and joy, so far from drawing away our thoughts and hopes from God, doth rather raise them up more gently from the earth, to fly towards Him. For one who should wish to contemplate the beauty of a glorious summer's day would not go forth and boldly raise his eyes, and fix them upon the burning luminary, from which all its radiance and warmth proceed, well knowing that he would thereby only dazzle and afflict his sight ; but rather, casting them lower, he would let them wander over the milder diversity of Nature's face. Or, if possible, he would rest them upon a well-tilled garden ; and as he

there observed the rich variety of shape, and hue, and fragrance, and loveliness in the flowers that surrounded him, remembering that all these divers forms and qualities are but the reflection and production of that source of light which brings them into being, he would thereby conceive a sweeter and livelier idea of that day's splendour, and of that luminary's benefits, than if he had at once gazed upon his brightness. And in like manner, when we wish to meditate upon the glories of God's eternal day, we will not at once dart our glance on that Father of lights, who dwelleth in light inaccessible, but rather will pause to meditate upon the beauties of his heavenly Eden ; and when we contemplate assembled together the unstained Virgin and the empurpled martyr, and the triumphant apostle, and all the other orders of heavenly beings, with one rising above the rest, and uniting in herself the excellencies of them all ; and when, moreover, we remember that all these charms are but emanations and reflections of His effulgence, we shall assuredly form a truer and more consoling estimate of His beauty and beneficence and mighty power, than if we had awed and overwhelmed our minds by sternly gazing upon His splendour—(p. 310).

In the Pastoral on the institution of the Forty Hours' Adoration occurs the following passage :—

So it comes that Heaven worships now the nature of man indivisibly united with the Godhead, and Earth adores the Deity, joined inseparably to our humanity, in the Person of the incarnate Word. Hence is our worship and theirs but one : one in object, one in value, one in sentiment, one, if possible, in form. For so identical, throughout this communion of saints, is the essence of divine worship, that the very mode of its performance necessarily becomes similar, not to say one. So that in reading the glorious visions of heaven's sanctuary thrown open to S. John, it becomes difficult to determine whether he there beheld counterparts to what the Church had already instituted upon earth, or types which served her, under apostolic guidance, for the framing of her ritual. But rather would we say that the same divine instinct guided both, and taught angels in heaven, and saints on earth, to adore and to love with the same outward expression. And so the whole forms but one Church and one worship. There is one altar in both, beneath which the slain for Christ rest, and on which the same Victim-Lamb reposes ; one censor from which prayer rises fragrant, from ministers' to angels' hands ; one bench of venerable elders, that sit or fall prostrate in rich array around ; one choir, one song, one voice, one heart, one life—(p. 392).

In the Sermon on Devotion to the Blessed Virgin occur these words :—

We may imagine how, then, the whole of heaven was moved at seeing her approach, and how the angels and saints may indeed have said : " Who is this so wonderfully favoured, now coming up from that desert below, flowing with delights, flowing with graces, with majesty and beauty ? " If to others have been granted these gifts to the fulness of the cup, her fulness is that of the fountain overflowing ever, and yet ever at the full. And she is introduced not as others might be, led by guardian angel or patron saint through

the opening ranks of that celestial host to the throne of God, and there kneeling before the faithful Rewarder of His servants, hear those words spoken, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant," but from the door of Heaven, leaning, in the full confidence of love, on her beloved, as a bride on her bridegroom, as a mother may lean on her son—(p. 291).

A similar passage is found in another sermon :—

If the saints in heaven have golden vials given them, as we are told in the Apocalypse, filled with our prayers, as with sweet odours, which those pour out before the throne of God, with what fragrance must those be endowed which are shed from hers? . . . And if the Word of God has told us that Jesus, ascended into heaven, has prepared corresponding emblems of reward for every state of holiness, golden harps for the patriarchs, and robes of whiteness for the virgins, and palms for the martyrs, and seats of judgment for the Apostles, and crowns of glory for all that love Him, by what emblem shall we describe the reward which must have been bestowed upon her, who closed the line of patriarchal holiness, forming, as it were, the wall of separation between the two covenants; who, though a mother, was pure so as no virgin else was ever pure; whose martyrdom of inward grief was deemed by the Spirit of God fit matter of holy prophecy; who with the Apostles received the unction of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, and who alone of all mankind could say that she had loved Jesus with a mother's love—(p. 321).

The following beautiful passage is taken from the sermon "The two great Mysteries of Love":—

We who were to come eighteen hundred years too late to enjoy His company in the flesh, had as large and as warm a place in His heart as they who entertained Him in their houses. It was but natural for us to expect from Him some ingenious contrivance, some institution of Almighty love, whereby His sojourn on earth should be prolonged until the end of time. Even in the Old Law, His presence by visible emblems, which gave assurance and promised mercy, was made permanent in His holy place. While Israel dwelt in the wilderness, His cloud overshadowed the Tabernacle; and both there and in the Temple the Holy of Holies contained a mercy-seat, whereon He sat between the cherubim to receive the supplications of priests and people. And if this was a figure or symbol of Him who alone has wrought propitiation for many, was it otherwise than reasonable to expect, in that Law when realities succeeded to shadows, truths to figures, there should be some provision for a corresponding token of God's presence, securing, however, its reality and truth? Such precisely was supplied us in the Blessed Eucharist, in which Christ is with us, our true Emanuel, ever residing in our sanctuaries, the full accomplishment of His manifestation in the flesh; the firmly securing to all ages and all places, of one of the greatest blessings of His incarnation, His dwelling amongst us—(p. 97).

We cannot omit the two following passages on the Sacred Heart of Jesus:—

What else is the blessed heart of Jesus but the wonderful alembic which transmuted the food of earth, not merely into the nourishment of one body, and the life-stream of one person, but into the quickening support of millions, into the circulation of unity through the entire Church of ages, into the ransom beyond price of all mankind, into the golden flood, which flowing ever from the foot of the Lamb, waters and fertilizes heaven and earth, becomes the river of life to one, the stream of grace to the other. For what, again, is the adorable heart of Jesus but the fountain of paradise, whence springs the river that is divided into four branches, carrying refreshment, healing, and life to every region and to every race? One is a laver of cleansing and regenerating water, washing away all sin and stain; another is a bath, that restores or increases tone and vigour to those who have to wrestle and fight for God; a third is a rich flow of consecrating unction, such as streamed from the head of Aaron; while the last and best is the refreshing torrent of delights, at which saints drink with renewed rapture, and forgiven sinners with strengthening relish—(p. 375).

Ever holy and adorable symbol of love, immense and undying, yet compressed and death-stricken, Heart, not of Jesus alone in the flesh, but Heart of the entire Church, Heart of the universe, beating still in blissful throbs, the hours and the minutes, nay the instants, of forgiveness, of grace, of salvation to earth, of joy, and beatitude, and ecstasy to heaven! we salute Thee in homage, we worship Thee in adoration, we entreat Thee suppliant! Take to Thyself in tender embrace the children of Thy poor in this city, where light is the most brilliant and darkness the most deep. . . . Shield and harbour them, feed and strengthen them, for power and abundance are laid up in Thee, O great and admirable Heart! If not, how would the world have been redeemed? But be it our honour and our merit, that Thou receive them from us. We will snatch them up from their dereliction, we will break their snares, we will rescue them from the wicked fowlers, who are spreading nets on every side; and we will consign them to that happy embrace, which joins heart to heart, the weak, fluttering, trembling heart, to the noble, the impregnable, and yet most sweet and tender of hearts—to Thine, O Jesus!—(p. 390).

The following words are too characteristic of the writer, and of his familiarity with the *Via Patriciana* and the Church of S. Pastor, contained in the Church of S. Pudenciana, now his own title as Cardinal, to be omitted:—

Imagine S. Peter and S. Paul, with perhaps Aquila, and Prisca, and Linus, and Clement, standing at the gate of this city [Rome], the fisherman and the tent-maker, in their outlandish, uncouth garbs, looking through the lines of the ferocious guards into its hard, ungenial heart. Patricians and ladies of highest rank, corrupted citizens steeped in idleness and luxury, philosophers and sophists, orators and poets, with an imperial court uniting every element of man's highest powers and attainments—such are the inhabitants; while every material object exhibits grandeur or beauty, whatever can excite admiration, or inspire attachment to things of this earth.

It is to these men that they are sent, to induce them to uproot and cast off all these feelings.

Is it on a fool's errand that they are come? Shall they turn back, or, like Jonas, enter in and boldly preach penance, or the wrath to come?

If their steps faltered for a moment, and they required encouragement, we may easily imagine such words as these to have come down from heaven, or rather the remembrance of them to have echoed in their hearts:—"Fear not, little flock, for it hath well pleased your Father to give you a kingdom."

Yea, *this* kingdom; this empire at whose gate ye stand. Go on, and fear not, little flock. This city is wise, and you are foolish; it is strong, and you weak; it great, you little; it rich, you poor; it noble, you abject. But remember, again, this city, and the empire which it commands, is as the huge mass, inert and helpless; you the small handful of leaven to be thrown into it and ferment it. It is as a corrupting and perishing provision for the grave; you are the few grains of salt that will refreshen it. In both it is the lesser that overcome and transmutes the greater.

Thank God that it was so then, or the world would never have been converted. For the little flock walked on; that loathsome heap of Pagan corruption was salted; that mass of lifeless learning was fermented; and Christian civilization and Christian wisdom sprang from the quickened, re-animated decay.

And "the kingdom" became Peter's, and this city as its capital. But it was from a Cross that he ruled over it. He bore to the end the scandal of that Cross, which his good Master told him, too truly, would at first make him fly. Instead of its being his stumbling-block, it became and remained his strength; and he bequeathed to imperial Rome, for ever, the twofold legacy of the Wisdom of God, and the Power of God, which are in Jesus Christ, and Him crucified. Blessed is he who is not scandalized in either—(p. 185).

The three following passages are from the second volume. They are of a practical kind. In the sermon on "The Difficulty of Salvation to the Rich" the Cardinal says:—

Two considerations will justify this truth. The first is, that in riches those virtues are not less demanded, whose proper seat is poverty and obscurity. Humility, the virtue of the lowly, of the contemned, of the despised, is even more necessary in the palace than in the cottage. Yet, in the latter, it seems to be growing on the very walls, it springs spontaneously from the very ground; while in the former, it has to be cultivated with painful care, amidst the attentions paid to rank, the flattery of inferiors, the suggestions of pride. Mortification, which appears to be only the offspring and sanctifier of indigence, is the still more necessary curb of abundance; but, then, to the former, it is only a movement of the will, consecrating a necessary want; to the latter, it is a difficult exertion, imposing involuntary restraint. Patience was sent to be the comforter of the distressed, but it must no less be the badge of the wealthy Christian; but, then, to the former it has become an

habitual feeling; the latter must put it on under a galling contrast with former comfort and ease.

It might be some compensation, if at least there were some virtues which might be said to be more exclusively the property of the rich; but this is my second observation, that even those virtues for which riches give an apparent advantage, *can* be, and generally *are*, as fully discharged by the poor. Charity, the queen of virtues, and the beloved of the Most High, is the quality which seems most decidedly in the exclusive reach of the wealthy. It is precisely with regard to it that our Blessed Redeemer has decided the point, and decided it, as might have been anticipated, on the side of His favourite poor. "Looking on, he saw the rich men cast their gifts into the treasury. And He saw also a certain poor widow casting in two copper mites. And he said, 'Verily I say to you, that this poor widow has cast in more than they all.'"—(S. Luke, xxi. 1—3.)

To conclude this argument, I have only to observe, that Jesus Christ is the model of all our virtues, and that he practised them all in their brightest perfection. Now, it was in a state of poverty that He proposed His example; and difficult as it must be to imitate His virtue at all, how infinitely must that difficulty be increased when it has to be transferred to a different state, and when the poor, the meek, the humble, and mortified Jesus of Nazareth has to be copied in the purple and fine linen of the rich man, feasting sumptuously every day—(Vol. ii., 52, 54).

The following passage is very simple and beautiful:—

The figure of a husbandman is evidently a favourite one in the word of God, when speaking of the pains taken by His providence for the welfare of mankind in general, and of His more chosen people in particular. It, in fact, describes more accurately than any other could do, the exact relation between the will of man, in his present state, and the power of God, which directs and assists him. When He speaks of having created us, He compares Himself to the potter who fashions the clay at his will, and makes it a vessel of whatever form he may have designed. For such a one's work is entirely in his own hands; the success of his labour depends completely upon his skill; and it comes forth from his fingers perfect as he intended it, unable to thwart his design, or to disappoint his expectations. And so in like manner God, when He created us, asked for no co-operation from us. We know not how it was with us till we had been formed by Him, perfect in body and soul, fitting vessels for His mercy and grace. But very different does the other image represent Him to us, in explaining His providential action upon us, after this first favour has been conferred. The husbandman toils more than the potter to insure himself success. He ploughs up the hard soil again and again, he cleanses it of all that can hurt his future crop; then he casts upon it a choice and well-prepared seed, which he covers over, and protects from the birds of the air. He sits not at home, as the other, to his work, nor finishes it in one brief hour. But in the sweat of his brow he toils abroad, under the fiercest sun in summer, amidst the drenching rains of winter; he labours through weeks and months unceasingly, and gives little or no rest to the apple of his eye. And when he hath done all this, when he hath

exercised all his science, and exhausted all his ingenuity, and busied himself all the year, can he make sure of his success? No; but he waiteth patiently to see what the earth will repay him for all his labour. It may be an abundant return; but the ungrateful soil may disappoint all his hopes, render vain all his exertions, and bring down his curse upon itself.

When this image is applied, as it so often is in Scripture, to things spiritual, when God is the husbandman, and man the earth, it affords matter for awful considerations"—(vol. ii., pp. 299, 300).

The last passage we will quote is taken from a very thoughtful Sermon on "Religious Unity":—

But contenting ourselves, for the present, with the first conclusion, where, let us ask, is the imperfection of method which prevents all men arriving at according conclusions in their search after truth? It consists primarily in overlooking the great characters whereby it is distinguished; in seeking it by parts, instead of considering it as an indivisible and perfect whole. The moment the unity of the truth is acknowledged, that is to say, the principle that of many conflicting opinions only one can be correct, it will be easily discovered to possess an unifying power. For, if all who possess of those many opinions the true one *must* necessarily agree, while the holders of the rest may differ, and likewise change, so did we observe that many professed to have one belief perfectly accorded in every particular, and never altered their convictions, while all others broke away from one another on every side, and were each easily led to pass from one to another opinion; we should conclude, on a strong ground of probability, that they who agreed were right rather than those who, so individually and relatively, varied. At the least, it would lead any reasonable man to give the earliest and most impartial consideration to the claims of that body which possessed that unifying power, which is so obvious a consequence of the unity of truth.

Further, our dissensions are kept alive by men seeking individual truths, rather than the principle of truth. The former may be found, mixed with errors, in the most corrupt or most absurd religions; where the latter exists, error can have no place. A generous and feeling as well as upright and determined mind is necessary for its discovery. It requires the entire system of religion to be considered on a comprehensive scale, the quenching of many prejudices upon individual points, the suppressing of partial curiosity, to investigate practices, and search out abuses, rather than follow out principles to their root and foundation. It demands the accurate comparison of first postulates in different systems, referably to sound reason, the divine attributes, and the Word of God. And beyond all it requires the willing determination to embrace any principle, when discovered, with all its consequences, however individually they may seem to contradict our previous convictions, or thwart our desires. Let the study of jarring claims be essayed and judged in their first elements and fundamental principles alone, and the cause will soon be decided"—(Vol. II., pp. 310, 311).

It is impossible for us to dismiss these volumes with a simple criticism of their contents. In most cases, this is all

a Reviewer ought to do. The writing, and not the writer, is the subject-matter of his remarks. But in this instance it is hardly possible, for the writings derive, besides their intrinsic worthiness, a special interest from the writer from whose hand they come. It is full of interest to trace out the early working of a mind which for the last five-and-twenty years has partly been mixed up with all the great movements which have restored the Catholic Church in England, and partly has led and directed them as their head and chief. We seem to see in them the germs of what we see now in its maturity. And the bearing of it upon our present state is so intimate and direct, that we cannot refrain from noticing it somewhat more fully. The first feature which strikes us in all that has come from the pen of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, from his first volume of Lectures to his Pastoral of last summer, is its perfect sameness. We do not see anywhere the changes, precipitations, the alternate advances and retreats, the modifications and uncertainty of judgment which characterize the public life and published writings of so many men of acknowledged learning and power. A certain steadfast growth always expanding itself from one centre, and always homogeneous and identical with its past, is the character of the writer's mind. Few men have written more variously: works on the Syriac language, on Catholic Doctrine, on Polemical Theology, on the Evidence of the Fathers, on Art, Taste, History, Biography, Reminiscences of Pontiffs, Poetry; works of pure imagination; essays on the most miscellaneous subjects; and yet in their great variety one mind pervades all, and one spirit quickens all—the mind and spirit of a true Christian and an ultramontane Catholic. From first to last there is no wavering, no uncertainty, no minimizing of the doctrines and laws of the Church. It is seldom that such a sameness can be found through a life so long, and so exterminated by both words and writings. This seems to be the peculiar benefit of a Catholic formation. And perhaps few men in England, at this day, have had it more completely. Born in Catholic Spain, reared at Ushaw, educated in Rome, where all his early life was spent, the Cardinal has never known what it is to have a mutilated faith or an incoherent theology. To the twenty years spent in Rome must be ascribed the peculiar largeness of apprehension as to the office and action of the Catholic Church, which has marked his whole career. Looking back upon it, who can doubt that it was the providential formation for the mission which awaited him in England? There are two things which Rome does for a priest, and which we believe no other place

can do in the same degree. The one is to expel from the mind the national, local, personal prejudices derived from race, education, social usage, family tradition, and to give it a breadth, comprehensiveness, and variety in its appreciations of the Church, her mind, her instincts, her organization, her religious orders, her devotions. Rome, as the focus of the Universal Church, contains in germ all that exists throughout Catholic Unity. There, as S. Cyprian says, "the Sacerdotal Unity takes its rise," and from thence every religious order derives itself; to it all refer,—there the secular and religious clergy live in an unity which arises only from a consciousness of their reciprocal needs and duties, and that the perfection of each depends upon the other; there, too, all nations have their churches. "The nations of the redeemed," as S. John writes, "walk in the light of the Jerusalem of the New Law." Any one who has lived in Rome will have received an impression of the unity, and universality of the Church, and of the diversity of her spiritual creations, which will for life govern his judgment, and suggest a multitude of undertakings by which the spirit and action of Rome may be reproduced in all parts of the world. Witness the last fourteen years in the Diocese of Westminster.

The other effect seems to us to be a keen perception of the presence and working of truth and falsehood. Nothing strikes us more than the intense feeling aroused in the mind of a Catholic, born and nurtured in the atmosphere of a Catholic land, especially in Rome itself, by the enunciation of opinions which pious and devoted Catholics in Protestant countries not only listen to unmoved, but sometimes even hold in perfect unconsciousness of their being tinged with, or near to heterodoxy. It is to be feared that we are all more or less acclimatized to the atmosphere of England. Things which shock foreign Catholics, and bring our Catholic loyalty into doubt, are often so familiar to us, that we do not perceive them. We can well understand that some people will explain this by saying that Catholics, and especially Romans, are narrow, extravagant, bigoted, intolerant, and behind the age. We must rather say that they have been nurtured in the focus of the Christian and Catholic tradition, and that their spiritual senses have a delicacy and a sensitiveness which is imperceptibly lost in such a land and atmosphere as ours.

It has always appeared to us that these two qualities—the largeness not only of sympathy, but of intellectual apprehension, and the quick discernment of the signs and movements of truth which characterize the mind of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, were a preparation for the two especial works

which constitute his mission in England. Those two works seem to us to have been, first, the appreciation and direction of the tendency of religious thought which has arisen since the Emancipation of Catholics, and secondly, the development of the Catholic organization since the restoration of the Hierarchy.

Now the first of these is so intimately associated with the subject of this article, that we cannot forbear to dwell awhile upon it. That there is in England a visible tendency towards the Catholic Church is undeniable, and even self-evident. Saints, as we read, have foretold its return to Catholic unity; and illuminated and pious men, like Hotzhauser and F. Dominic, have confidently spoken of it, as is well known. Certainly the phenomena around us at this moment conspire the same way. The fears of Protestants, who are always clamouring about the spread of Romanism, and the hopes of Catholics, who see the daily expansion of the Church among the English people, alike point to it. But this which is manifest to us in the year 1864 was not so when Dr. Wiseman came to England in 1835. We can, as we think, trace somewhat of this in the Sermons before us, by comparing the suggestive, courteous, and deferential tone in which he addressed English Protestants at the *Gesù e Maria*, or the Church of Monte Santo, with the outspoken and authoritative voice of the *Garibaldi Pastoral* in last summer. However, that the Catholic Church in England is re-asserting itself, so as it has never done since the reign of Elizabeth, is undeniable. It is not now, as it was in the time of James the Second, the royal religion, exotic, and suspended in the air like an orchid, without contact with the broad soil of England, and therefore feeble, sickly, and kept alive chiefly by artificial warmth. The Catholic religion of to-day has its roots among the people, and mixed with the iron and the clay, which make the feet of the great image of English society. It has established itself in public opinion, as a fact which cannot be ignored, and is known to the people of England as an institution or estate in the realm. It lives, too, not an exotic life, but from the life and vigour, intellectual and moral, of the British race. All these things are overlooked by some of our supercilious antagonists, who think to show themselves to be strong by contemptuous and imaginary descriptions of our weakness. It is a favourite topic of such rhetorical persons to describe the present restoration of the Catholic Church in England as one of those transient movements which have already appeared and re-appeared in the history of Europe and of

this country. In the remarks we purpose to make, though for another end, we hope to dispose of this illusion.

It appears to us that in accounting for this undeniable tendency towards the Catholic Church, we are all liable to take too narrow a view as to its cause. Men account for what they see by some local, proximate, or personal cause, which being immediately before them, and forming a prominent part in their own past history, they exaggerate with undue importance. Events are assumed to be the chief and adequate causes of effects to which they are only subordinate and tributary. It appears to us that to account for what we see at this day, we must go back, not only to the last thirty years, but to the beginning of the century, and indeed to a law which has been in uniform operation for the last three hundred years.

First, then, it is evident that ever since the great outbreak of the so-called Reformation, there has been in all Protestant countries, even less perhaps in England than in others, a reaction towards the Catholic Church. Lord Macaulay has observed this law of oscillation in his review of Ranke's History of the Popes. It is certain that in Germany and in France, down to the end of the last century, Protestantism had perpetually declined as an intellectual or religious system, and Catholicism had perpetually regained its ground against it. The true antagonist of Catholicism was infidelity. Voltaire and Rousseau, not Calvin or Luther, were its natural opponents. Then came the great French revolution, which for a time seemed to sweep all before it; but it caused the reaction which set in with the beginning of the present century. From that day to this the tide has turned towards the Catholic Church. In Germany many men of the highest mind embraced Catholicism, such as Count Stolberg, Frederick Schlegel, also Hurter in Switzerland. Later again, arose Klee, Mohler, and others, who defended the Catholic religion with an erudition new in those days, thereby helping onward the turn of public feeling. In France the zeal of certain Catholics of great name, such as Chateaubriand, De Maistre, De Bonald, powerfully forced onward the reaction towards Catholic faith and piety. The whole history of France for the last fifty years has been a reviving of the Catholic Church; truly described by Count Montalembert as a resurrection, to which he, together with Gerbet, De Salignis, De Falloux, largely contributed. All this, which was passing in a country so near to us, was not without its influence on England. When the tide turns, the tidal rivers rise. It is certain that the rising again of the Catholic Church and religion in its vigour and intelligence among the great French people, powerfully affected the public

opinion of England. Catholicism has been expanding on the Continent since the beginning of this century, and more than its undulations reached to our shores. The movements were simultaneous and analogous in France and in England, having a common cause. To this must be added the powerful effect of the piety, patience, fidelity, and heroic Christian faith of a multitude of French ecclesiastics, who were cast on the charity of the English, and nobly received by them into their inmost homes; and the special benediction of heaven which has fallen upon the homes and children of those who harboured them with so much true Christian generosity. In many of those families, at this day, this seed of the Catholic faith has borne its fruit.

Two other very signal causes were in operation: the one, that the minds of men were awakened to the intolerable atrocity of the penal laws in England and in Ireland; the other, the unexampled multiplication of the Irish people in the midst of poverty, nakedness, and want. All these things, especially in their combination with the political discontent of both countries, sustained and urged home by the alarming agitation of the Catholics in Ireland, at length produced the Emancipation, which appears to us to have been both the effect of all these causes, and afterwards, in itself, a cause of effects bearing immediately on the reaction towards the Catholic Church. The Emancipation brought Catholics once more in contact with the public opinion and the private life of England. They could no longer be ignored, or hid under a bushel. Protestants were compelled to see and hear them in society and in Parliament—to eat and drink with them—to lay their hand on their mouth, and to learn another speech than the speech of Semei, which for centuries had been a sort of English gospel. Catholic worship was once more visible. Catholic festivals were celebrated. Live Bishops, in mitres, hitherto beheld only in pictures or on brasses, were to be seen baptizing, ordaining, consecrating. Catholic books were advertised, sold, and read. Catholic preachers delivered lectures on the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church. There can be no doubt that the same expansive power which produced the Emancipation, carried the Catholic Church onward in its manifestation to this country, and that the Emancipation powerfully contributed to the same result.

But another effect of the same great change was felt by the Protestant Establishment. For centuries it had been exclusively supported by its legal privileges and endowments; by the silencing of its adversaries, and the suppression of their teaching and their worship. Now all alike had a fair field; and

the Anglican system for the first time had to take its chance with others. From the hour that its swathing was taken off, it has gone to pieces. Even the undeniable energy and movement which has sprung up within it has had the same effect. The rapid action and reaction of opinion within its pale, the extremes which have deployed themselves on either wing towards Rome or towards Rationalism, have precipitated the advance of dissolution which is irresistibly at work within it. The influences both of the Catholic Church and of Dissent have, since the year 1830, told powerfully upon the Anglican Church. It has found itself compelled to defend its very life by arguments which, when free and open, cannot fail to turn to its disadvantage. The action of the Legislature also in reducing it from its exclusive pre-eminence, and in placing both Catholics and Dissenters upon the same level, in many respects produced, in the Anglican Church, a vehement assertion of its ecclesiastical purity and authority, its spiritual origin, organization, and office, its independence of the civil power and the like, which were never so loudly asserted as at the moment, when an Act of Parliament had suppressed twelve bishoprics in Ireland, and taken from the English Establishment the administration of its property. From these events may be dated the Oxford movement, which is popularly thought, and even represented by some who have more than ordinary knowledge of it, as the chief cause of the tendency of minds to the Catholic Church. To many it undoubtedly was so; but to many more it was only one among many causes. From what has been said above, it would seem to us to have been itself an effect of a wider and more general return of men's minds towards a doctrine and discipline more consistent than Protestantism, and more worthy of respect than State religions. And this appears to us to be proved also, by the fact that in England two other great movements seem to have accomplished themselves. In the hundred and fifty years from Elizabeth to Anne, a gradual decline of religious belief had developed itself. The hierarchical Anglicanism of Elizabeth had gradually settled down into the latitudinarianism of the 18th century. From that time a reaction began which has never ceased to this day. First, the divine origin of revelation was established by Butler, Warburton, and others, against Free-thinkers and Deists; next, the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation, by Waterland and Jones of Nayland, against the Arians and Socinians of the last century. Then came a profuse preaching of the doctrines of redemption and grace, of conversion and of repentance, against the low, unspiritual religion of sixty years ago. Then the doctrine of

sacraments was revived; witness the endless controversy on baptismal regeneration. At this crisis the Oxford movement arose, and seems to us to verify a kind of prediction made by an Anglican clergyman of much discernment, founded, in all probability, upon some such grounds as we have here given. He used to say, "The day will come when the doctrine respecting the Church, which has been so long forgotten or denied, will return and avenge itself." This, in the Oxford movement, it literally did. The lost truth of the organization, authority, and office of the Church was the basis of all. It was demanded by all that had gone before; and it came by a national evolution out of the progress of previous ideas in the religious mind of England. It is not our purpose to describe that movement, which was directed by men whose piety, learning, and intellectual power need no testimony from us. Their writings had, no doubt, the direct effect of bringing many into the Catholic Church. Living together, or near to each other, in or about Oxford, it was inevitable that they should powerfully affect each other's minds. Their writings, and the works they edited, extended widely through the country; and if they did not by their own influence bring men to the Catholic Church, they certainly threw them from their previous convictions upon the study of the Fathers, the Schoolmen, and the Saints. In all parts of England men who had no communication with Oxford, except by a rare letter and a rarer visit, who never wrote a line in the *Tracts for the Times*, and had little relation to those whose names have become celebrated, began to draw towards the Church. They had no leader or guide. They differed, in many things, from those who led the University of Oxford. They were largely indebted to them for their books, but still more for directing them to the study of Catholic theology. But they were each one labouring alone in his own field, and following out painfully, by his own thoughts and prayers, the path of twilight which was leading him into perfect faith. It has always seemed to us that this afforded a singular evidence of the truth. Minds the most various, with antecedents the most remote, from every class of society, and moved by every kind of reason, verifying the truth expressed in that beautiful book *Comptium*, came up obeying a wide-spread influence, which was manifold, diffused everywhere, yet isolated, impersonal, and visibly supernatural and divine.

Now all these causes had been conspiring to form an intellectual and spiritual crisis in the mind of multitudes of the English people; not only in those who afterwards became Catholics, but in the far greater number who, though they

remain still out of the unity of the Church, nevertheless have moved upwards towards a more perfect knowledge of Christianity, and advanced almost to the frontier of the Catholic faith.

At such a moment as this, it was that Dr. Wiseman came to England, and published his "Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church," which have now for nearly thirty years exercised a most powerful influence in bringing minds to the faith. A few years later, as coadjutor to the Vicar-Apostolic of the Midland district, Bishop Wiseman began a most important work, which may be accurately described as constituting one half of his mission in England, the discerning and encouraging of the intellectual movement, the causes of which we have been tracing out. It was perhaps not wonderful that the Catholics in England should have failed to discern its true character. The fresh eye of one coming from without, generally notes more quickly and truly the things which from our familiarity with them, day by day, we fail to see. So it was with the signs of those times. There were many good and vigilant men who failed to understand, or even to see them, and therefore were disposed to judge somewhat hardly of those who were more hopeful than themselves, not sparing even the Bishop of Melipotamus. Nevertheless he held on his way, and encouraged with great kindness and confidence every tendency towards Catholic thought. Perhaps among the best and ablest of his writings may be ranked the Articles on the High Church Claims, and the Anglican Donatism, in the DUBLIN REVIEW. It has always appeared to us, that Dr. Wiseman owed to Rome this keen and sensitive perception which enabled him to detect the working of Catholic truth, where others saw only a learned heterodoxy; and enabled him not only to understand it, but to minister to it, and to help it onward to its full perfection and rest in the infallible Church of God.

Very different, indeed, was the early vigour and simplicity of that movement from its late developments at this time. We have the deepest desire for the unity of Christendom; and for that reason we abhor with our whole soul, with our whole strength, the Photian schism, and the Anglican Reformation which rent it asunder. If the laying down of life would re-unite it, no Catholic would be slow to offer himself to heal the wounds which schism has made. But no Catholic would hesitate likewise to lay down his life for truth, which comes before unity, and is its only principle and source. We cannot, therefore, but deplore the want of vigilant foresight, which has entangled, as members and co-operators, some

who have deserved so well of the Catholic Church in England, in an alliance, the inevitable effect of which is to obscure the true and divine unity which springs alone from the exclusive infallibility of the Catholic and Roman Church. We cannot doubt that their motives were pure and full of charity, but we must not be silent as to the effect which to us appears inevitable. We are well aware that it is said that in their association of prayer for the unity of Christendom no one is committed to the opinions of others, that no mutual recognition is involved. But this seems to us to acknowledge the unlawfulness of such an alliance. It is impossible for a Catholic to accept this passive attitude towards heresy and schism. He is bound to testify against the position of those with whom he is thus unnaturally united. They assume to possess "the name of Catholic and the Priesthood." He knows these assumptions to be false, and knowing it he is bound to testify against them; and to testify against them by refusing all contact with them in matters of religion. It is certain that his uniting with them confirms them in their assumptions. It is a fact, that of the Catholics who unite with them there are some who expressly recognize Anglicans as Anglo-Catholics, and their ministers as Priests. Such is the fact, and such is the tendency of all who join in it, whether they will or no. It is also a fact that in two publications, the "*Union Review*," and the volume of sermons published by the same hands, matter which is erroneous, scandalous, schismatical, and heretical, is contained. And these publications are partly written by Catholics; and in their writings may be found abundant matter, certainly both erroneous and scandalous; we fear also at least savouring of both schism and of heresy. It is in vain, therefore, to represent this as an union only of prayer. It is an union of manifold intellectual and spiritual dangers to all concerned in it; to Protestants, whom it encourages and deceives, and to Catholics, who become entangled in unlawful communion with both heresy and schism, and with those who are adversaries of the exclusive unity and infallibility of the only true Church. The Holy Office, with the instinct which in Rome never fails, has most precisely appreciated and most justly condemned this sad alliance. We should not have touched upon this subject were it not for one strange fact. Of all men in England the last who could be imagined to be favourable to such an untenable alliance is the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, whose every instinct and every intuition, awakened and matured under the eye and the action of the Holy See, would make him the first to discern and to expose the illusion. And yet it has been his name which,

with a fatuity of assumption, the Unionists have paraded in paper after paper, as not only countenancing their schemes, but even as regretting the act of the Holy See by which they have been condemned. It is the very love of Unity which would make him before almost any other man condemn the Union ; and his Catholic instinct would make him to be the first to free his hands from all contact with those who, being out of the unity of the Fold, assume the incommunicable name of Catholic. A more unwarrantable use of a great name, in violation of all its traditional and devout loyalty to the only Divine Voice, and the only way of Salvation upon earth—for which, too, he has suffered, and would have exposed, if need were, even his life—cannot be conceived. To propagate the delusion that the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster was favourable to an union of Greeks, Anglo-Catholics, and Roman Catholics was a grave delusion ; to imagine that a Prince of the Church and a foremost Son of the Holy See could so much as tolerate for a moment that which the Holy Office had condemned, deserves harder words than we, unless compelled by events hereafter, would be willing to use. The eye which read the earlier movement towards the Church, was equally keen and prompt to discern the true character of the later.

And now it is time for us to make an end. We hail gladly the two volumes as a healthy and solid addition to our Catholic literature. They are from first to last perfectly uniform, exhibiting the growth and expansion of a mind which has one type and one law of its maturity, the most perfect conformity to the mind of the Church—not as manifested in antiquity, or in the middle ages, not as interpreted by critical private judgment or fanciful eclecticism, but—as it expresses itself at this hour—in its living voice and onward march through the world, changeless ever, but always bringing out of its stores things old and new, by the perpetual action of the Divine assistance, and the infallible guidance of the Holy Ghost. If ever there was a man who courts and claims the reproach of Ultramontane, it is the Archbishop of Westminster. If there be any man who deserves to be called one-sided, but that always the right side, the side of the highest prerogatives of the Church and of the Holy See, it is he. There is in all the works which have come from his hand, an unity which springs from fixedness and identity, beginning in the dogma of faith, and expanding to the outer range of judgments and of opinions. He is, as we may say, never separated from the base of his operations—the Church of God, and Rome as its root and centre. Many men of great powers seem always traversing to and fro like a moveable

column, well stored, and self-sufficing, for a long time formidable and successful; yet, after all, uncertain, and evading all calculations as to what they may think and judge on questions as they arise. Not so with the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Resting upon the centre from which he issued forth some five-and-twenty years ago, his testimony is, as he has given it in his own words:—

Were it hinted that such consistency of sentiment was to be attributed to firmness of character, or depth of previous reflection, or early maturity of judgment, in the writer, it would be merely a boast, as misplaced as it would be false. Only a principle could stand the test of so many years; and in religious ideas only one principle can remain unchangeable. It is to render homage to this truth that I consider it a duty. Looking back over this long term of years, remembering how one fixed determination formed my whole stock of principles for theory and practice, and seeing how faithfully it has supplied the want of much learning, the absence of brilliant gifts, the dearth of popular topics, and deficiency in popular art, I have surely a right to prize it above all these advantages, and consider it a part of that heavenly wisdom which God refuses to none in His Church. And this was the determination to keep strictly under her guidance, to prize her orthodox teaching beyond all seductive theories, all brilliant paradoxes, all palliating explanations; to love Catholic truth, simple and unmodified as found at its centre, as practised by artless believers; to look there for purity of doctrine and accuracy of observance, where God has left the richest deposit for the future resurrection, in the ashes of His Apostles. This unbounded devotion to Christ's one Church, this undeviating adherence to her supreme Ruler, has been the chart and compass by which I have endeavoured to sail; and, while I humbly trust that not a word will be found in these volumes discordant with her teaching, her maxims, her desires, her thoughts, I submit to her correction all that is here written, and beg every obscurity or dubiousness to be interpreted on this principle. To this one elementary principle, which a child may have as easily as a man, I exclusively attribute any good results which may have flowed from these pages.—(*Essays on Various Subjects*, vol. I. Preface, p. xii.)

Such would appear to us to be the true character of a Churchman, who from his childhood loses in the Church all the obtrusive individuality which in after life mars so many men, and when he comes to maturity receives again from the Church his own with usury. He gave to the Church all he had, and all he was, to be taken up and to be reproduced. The Church gives back to him his own individuality with all its powers, but invested with her own mind, instincts, and endowments of elevation and of force. The Church makes him more than himself. He is guided by her light, judges by her discernment, speaks by her voice. The pride of the world denounces this as the bondage of a man to a system stronger than himself.

But what bondage can there be, if that system be the Church of God? *Ubi Spiritus Domini, ibi libertas*—where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty, and there only. A statesman may be he who is censorious of the past, discontented with the present, who changes, alters, innovates. The system under his hand is human, and could not be changeless if he would. A Churchman is he who is identified with the present mind and action of the living Church. It works in him and by him, he works in it and by it. There is a reciprocity, a twofold action, perfectly free, and perfectly distinct, but in its operations identified, and in its perfection indivisible. The excesses, aberrations, eccentricities of lesser minds, and even of great, are always out of harmony with the action of the Church. The true Servant and the great Ruler of the Church is he who, being penetrated with its mind, and instinct with its life, is ever in harmony with its operations, which though passing through human infirmity, nevertheless are always supernatural and divine.

Foreign Periodical Literature.

DR. DÖLLINGER AND THE MUNICH CONGRESS.

(Concluded from Vol. III. page 487.)

Civiltà Cattolica, March 19, and April 2, 1864.

7.—*Dr. Döllinger's estimate of the present condition of Philosophic and Sacred Sciences in Spain, Italy, and France.*

WE come now to modern times. So exorbitant do we here find Dr. Döllinger, both in his disparagement of other nations and in his exaltation of his own, that were it not for his evident good intention, accompanied by the most incredible amount of prejudice, his expressed opinions could be viewed in no other light than as so many puerile vaunts and imperinences. He starts from these premises :—As regards philosophical and theological science, in Spain we have nothing, in Italy nothing, in France very little—nothing, in short, of any value commensurate with present requirements. The conclusion at which he arrives is, in fact, that salvation is to come from Germany ; not only because it possesses everything requisite for constituting the Teutonic nation a master in divinity to the whole world, but for many other special causes. Reserving this topic to the last, we will here consider the premises.

To begin with Spain, he reckons that it is scarcely worth a word of notice. "For centuries," he says, "philosophical, theological, and historical studies have had no existence there. French translations supply all actual wants. The last generation saw Joachim Villanueva, a scholar of considerable historical and theological merit, arise amongst the Spanish clergy. Later, a solitary and quickly vanishing meteor, Balmes, appeared, whose works give manifest token of the deficiency of historical and theological culture in his country."

As for Italy, after citing some illustrious names in the first half of the eighteenth century, he adds :—"But already, in the middle of the last century, bitter complaints were made of the deep declension that clerical studies had undergone, and of the prevailing ignorance of the clergy. You must go back centuries to be able to name a single work of exegesis of any importance from the pen of an Italian theologian." After some pathetic lamentations over this deplorable condition of things, which he further establishes by quoting an opinion of Cesare Cantù as to the poverty of exegetical studies, and that of a learned German theologian expressed in a Würzburg journal, he proceeds :—"The three most gifted men of the Italian priesthood, Gioberti, Rosmini, and Ventura, are dead and gone ; the two last were destined to die in a foreign land ; and what splendid hopes had Balbo founded, in the year 1844, on these two men ! To them he looked for the restoration

in public opinion of the Italian priesthood to its former commanding position, or, at least, its exaltation to one of the foremost ranks. To an Italian priest these words, after the lapse of nineteen years, must read like a bitter jest. These three men fell under the Roman censorship; and it is matter of notoriety how Passaglia came to give up theology, of which science he was considered, in Italy, the most distinguished ornament. Too truly may it be said of other Italian cities, besides Naples, '*In otia nata Parthenope!*'" It is fair to add that the Professor assigns as some excuse for this Italian indolence, the political disturbances of which the Peninsula has been for many years the theatre.

With contemporary France Dr. Döllinger shows himself at first tolerably well satisfied. He speaks of it as in a far better condition, and quotes some names of note amongst the clergy. From his catalogue, however, we miss several we should have desired to see; in particular, that of Martinet, one of the best writers of our day, and of Gerdil, both of whom might have been classed as Italians so long as Savoy formed part of an Italian State; but why not reckon them now amongst the French? After offering this grain of incense, he begins to deal out bitter censure, almost as bitter as that which he had lavished on Spain and Italy. He asks where are the theologians of any eminence, members of the intellectual family of Petavius, Bossuet, and Arnold, men of vast and profound science? He asks and gets no answer. France has had no theologian for some time past, because she possesses no high school of theology and not a single school of ecclesiastical science. True, she has eighty or eighty-five seminaries, which, as establishments for the training of pastors, may be very good, and even excellent, but which cannot, at least according to German ideas, be viewed as scientific institutes; nay, further, so insufficient is the preparation they afford, that to the greater number of their pupils it is a sheer impossibility to raise a solid edifice of theological culture upon so slight and inadequate a basis.

These premises were indispensable in order to arrive at the foregone conclusion. But whoever is not so enamoured of that same conclusion is in a position to judge them dispassionately. Now it has already been observed that, during the latter part of the last century and down to nearly the middle of the present, there was no common philosophy universally professed in the schools, to supply the almost total abandonment of scholasticism, either in these three afore-mentioned countries, or in the remainder of Catholic Europe. The great Christian philosophy did not fall; it was foolishly abandoned, and succumbed under the weight of ridicule cast upon it at an unhappy period of mental aberration, when so many other Catholic institutions were in like manner surrendered and abolished. With the suppression of the religious orders, and the almost total transfer of the work of education to lay hands, scholasticism not only lost its most sure asylum, but was attacked on all sides by the new masters, to whom its Christian character not unfrequently furnished an amply sufficient motive for fierce hatred. Add to this the preference felt by a materialistic age for physics and the mathematical sciences, whence so much improvement was anticipated in the comforts of life and so much temporal advantage. In Germany there were special and still more efficacious causes in operation. In that country there existed a contempt for

antiquity, along with a pretension of forming, not only a new science, but a new state of society ; and, as one of its consequences, we must reckon the little or no esteem in which not a few among the Catholic doctors came to hold the authority of the Holy See, with an accompanying indifference to the light which sacred science lends to philosophy. In Italy, philosophy was nearly reduced to a nullity ; and as the human mind craves some pasture for the pure reasoning faculties, and the old system was supposed to be quite out of the question, attempts were made to construct new ones, all which died out with the individuals with whom they severally originated, or did not survive them long. Years were to pass before men should discover that it is as futile to attempt to invent a new philosophy as to invent new mathematics or a new jurisprudence. If Italy and France have lost more than a quarter of a century, and wasted the vigour of some of the most powerful intellects in sterile efforts, they have to thank Germany for it, which had raised the expectation that something likely would come of the work of Kant and his three most noted successors, who did but variously manipulate his nebulous abstractions, which, the closer you investigate them, only vanish the more into absurdity or nonentity. Dr. Döllinger mentions certain Italians who were misled by these expectations ; in France, it may be sufficient, passing over many other names, to recall those of Cousin, Damiron, and Jouffroy. To conclude : if turning heads with extravagances be teaching philosophy, then, indeed, is the rest of Europe indebted to Germany for its most eminent teachers.

Spain alone was proof against the seduction ; and in an age when the best to be looked for was to escape the German intellectual licence, even nullity might have been deemed a privilege of that nation, whence we do not believe there emanated any of those scientific monstrosities of which other lands were so prolific, and which, when they do not move us to laughter by their ludicrousness, make our hair stand on end by their satanic impiety. Strange it is that Dr. Döllinger—who, be it observed, takes no notice of the theological writers that illustrated Spain from the beginning till near the close of the eighteenth century, and of whom Gener* enumerates no less than forty-eight—when he comes down to modern times, should mention neither Andres nor Arevalo, nor Erras, but contents himself with naming the Jansenist Villanueva, who has not written a single work meriting the honour which the Munich Professor has been pleased to pay him. He was noted for his antimonarchical no less than for his Jansenistic opinions ; and, being selected by the Revolutionary Government of 1820 to be sent as *Chargé d'affaires* to the Papal court, the nomination was regarded by the Holy See as a fresh insult, and it accordingly declined to receive him. Perhaps it was this very circumstance, more than his scientific merit, that obtained for Villanueva the honour of this exceptional notice.

However, a country that has given to the world Donoso Cortes and Jaime Balmes, and whose National Assembly refused with wonderful unanimity to erect the liberty of worship into a law, has given, even scientifically speaking,

* "J. B. Gener, *Theologi Hispani, Theologia dogmatico-scholastica, perpetuis Prolusionibus polemicis historico-criticis illustrata.*" (Pp. 140-188).

such proof of the possession of sound principles, as to lead us to presume that its rational studies must have deserved some higher commendation beyond that of not having deviated into error. As for Balmes, in spite of the gratuitous censures of Dr. Döllinger, we think that from this "solitary and evanescent meteor" Europe has received more illumination than from all the modern German philosophers—those nebulous clouds which have for so long a time done nothing save obstruct the light. There is no one, perhaps, who has better exposed and confuted the dreams of heterodox Germany than a son of *in otia nata Parthenope*, the Neapolitan Baron Galluppi, who, as he never incurred the Roman censorship, seems to have lacked the best title to notice in the discourse we are considering. Nevertheless we freely confess—as indeed we have already done—that at the epoch in question no complete system of philosophy existed in Italy, unless the name can be applied to various useful elementary treatises, of more or less merit, for the young.

What were the results which this state of the rational sciences produced in the civil order of society, would be long to tell; suffice it to notice the perversion of ideas which ensued in the moral, political, social, and economical order—may we not say in every order, seeing that, as every science draws its universal principles from philosophy, it is impossible that it should flourish when these are deficient, feeble, or fallacious? As for speculative science, in foregoing the use of the scholastic philosophy it lost its peculiarly appropriate instrument, and, for want of this its trusty auxiliary, could not keep its ground. Although S. Thomas retained his former honour in the Catholic schools, and was consulted and quoted on particular questions, nevertheless men had become unable to grasp that vast synthesis of divine and human wisdom as a whole, because one of the cardinal pillars on which it was built had failed them. And here we may see how speculative science is a most convenient natural instrument to the Church, and even essential—*ut melius sit*, though not *ut simpliciter sit*. The Church, assuredly, did not fail because science failed; but it is beyond question that all the sacred studies suffered not a little thereby, particularly polemics, ascetics, and sacred eloquence. Moreover, the supremacy which sacerdotal science had hitherto maintained over lay was now, not only endangered, but in a measure lost; a supremacy which it had owed to the very fact that, possessing as a common patrimony the same principles, these principles in its hands were wider, sounder, and surer, because purified by their contact with revealed truths. In recording these sad facts, we have the consolation of noticing that persons are beginning to be very generally alive to them. But to go so far as to say that as regards history and sacred science all was, and is, lost in Catholic countries—all become night and darkness—and to attribute this to the Roman censorship and the consequent deficiency of patristic and exegetical works—these are but dreams of Dr. Döllinger, which hardly deserve a reply.

With reference to France, the injustice of the Professor's remarks is evidenced by the very names he records—Gerbet, Maret, Lacordaire, Gratry, Bautain, Dupanloup, Ravignan, Felix—to which he might have added, besides the two already mentioned, many others deserving notice: for instance, Dom Guéranger, Cardinals Gousset and Pitra, the Bishops of Arras, Poitiers, Nîmes, and Algeria; to name any one of whom is to refute the

assertion that "there is no theologian in France." But, speaking generally, in all the great questions which have been mooted there—that, for instance, of the maintenance of the Pope's temporal power, and of the vindication of the divinity of Jesus Christ—the clergy of that nation and its noble episcopate, in particular, have given such proofs of theological doctrine and Christian eloquence as might seem to argue a higher condition of the sacred studies than actually exists. It may be here observed that the rendering of these studies at the same time fuller and more solid, is matter of present serious contemplation; but we feel well assured that when this object is brought about, it will be in accordance with those Catholic ideas which have proved their worth practically in past centuries, not in accordance with the new Roman notions of Dr. Döllinger,—the wonderful efficacy of which at present all resides in the hopes of their promoters. But it is not true that to the question, where are the Petaviuses and the Bossuets in France? "no reply can be made." It may be replied, great men belong to every age, and the France of to-day is still illustrated by the light which they cast; and, supposing that extraordinary geniuses, just because they are extraordinary, cannot be an every-day product, the intended reproach becomes, in fact, a testimony of national glory: least of all, at any rate, are they entitled to cast such reproach who have never themselves produced anything of comparable merit, and whose very poverty in this respect shelters them from a similar reproof.

In Italy, as elsewhere, theology, during the period mentioned, was pretty well restricted to the more or less ample field of controversy; and it was considered to be sufficient preparation for the future ministers of the sanctuary if they were competently armed for that kind of warfare—although it may well be questioned whether in countries exclusively Catholic such should be the main end of sacerdotal studies. However this may be, without pretending that sacred studies flourished in any remarkable degree in the latter part of the eighteenth or early part of the present century—for how could they flourish in times of such revolutionary disturbance and affliction of the Church?—it might be sufficient to cite the names of Bernard de Rossi, Bianchi, Zaccaria, Mamachi, Mansi, Muzzarelli, Bolgeni, Marini, Garampi, to disprove the unqualified accusation of prevailing clerical ignorance (*die im Klerus herrschende Unwissenheit*) hurled by Dr. Döllinger in the face of the Italy of that period.

But to come down to present times, a theological work like that of P. Perrone's "Institutiones," which has gone through thirty editions, the greater part out of Italy, must have responded to a real demand of the schools; and certainly the supply to such demand did not come from Germany. And then Carlo Troya, another son of that Naples decried as grovelling in intellectual indolence, with his historical researches; Avogadro della Motta, with his treatises on Socialism and Marriage; Taparelli, with his social, moral, and economical studies—just what Dr. Döllinger considers as a great desideratum;* Andisio, with his analogous labours and his sacred

* The desire to see social economy treated according to Catholic principles was expressed by Dr. Döllinger at the Munich Congress. Did not the

didactic works ; and the Hellenist Peyron, and the Latinist de Vit, both excellent scholars ; and Cavedoni, and de Rossi, and Garrucci, equally eminent in sacred archaeology ; and Cardinal Mai in patristic studies ; and the Cardinal Mezzofanti, that prodigy of linguistic erudition ; and Patrizi, and Vercellone, deeply versed in biblical exegesis—such names are worthy, at least, to have a place alongside that of Vincenzo Gioberti. Who, indeed, would have expected to find that man represented as a luminary of sacred science in Italy, since every one knows that, after his first and anything but happy essays in philosophy, entirely of the German order, he devoted himself to politics and defamation ; his most prolix work, in fact, being a celebrated libel sufficient to ruin the reputation of a writer of greater deserts and a more solidly established fame than Gioberti ever enjoyed.

It is to the purpose to observe that Dr. Döllinger certainly does not give a striking example of historical criticism, when, desiring to pass judgment on the present state of the sciences, and especially of the sacred sciences, in Italy, he adduces the testimony of two laymen by no means conversant with the matter, given fifteen or twenty years ago ; one of whom, it may be added, Balbo, although his intentions were very good, wrote to further a political object. Can Dr. Döllinger believe that so staunch a Catholic would have spoken of Gioberti in 1849—still more in 1863—as he did in 1844 ? Would it not have been far better, instead of relying on incompetent authorities, to have cast an eye on a few of the works to which we have alluded—some of which, as those of Mai or Troya, are well known in Germany, while Patrizi's were printed in that country, and the most noted treatises of Taparelli have been translated into German. But it was an object to the champion of the "liberties of science" to give us to understand that the three most distinguished men amongst the Italian priesthood were precisely those who incurred the Roman censorship ; and to heighten the picture, he adds that the two last (Rosmini and Ventura) were doomed to die in a foreign land—thus leaving it to be inferred that the Roman censorship had to answer for this as well as for the disappointment of Balbo's fond hopes : moreover, he imputes, it is hard to say why, the defection of Passaglia to the same cause.

We have here well nigh as many errors as words. Very few are needed to set the matter in its true light. Let us take the statements in their order :—
1. The two men of whom Balbo speaks are the first two, not the last two as stated by Dr. Döllinger : that is to say, Gioberti and Rosmini, not Rosmini and Ventura. 2. Rosmini and Ventura were not extinguished by the Roman censorship. Some secondary works of theirs, and, so to say, foreign to the main subject of their studies, were, it is true, placed on the Index ; but, so far from losing ground in public opinion by this circumstance, they won additional titles to general esteem by the docility with which they both, and Ventura most remarkably, submitted to the Church's sentence. 3. Whether

worthy Professor know that in Italy this work is partly accomplished, and partly in process of accomplishment ? We may add that the subject has been attracting attention and suggesting valuable labours in other countries also. We need only instance the recent work of Charles Périn, Professeur de Droit, at the Catholic University of Louvain, "*De la Richesse dans les Sociétés Chrétiennes*."

you take the first two of Balbo or the last two of Döllinger, it is untrue to say that they "both died in a foreign land;" for Rosmini made a holy death at Stresa, in the principal house of the Congregation which he had founded. 4. Because the other two happened to die at Paris, instead of in their respective native countries, it cannot be inferred that this was the fault of the Roman censorship, which when it condemns books certainly does not banish the authors. Without pretending either to know or to inquire whether any other powers closed the gates of Italy against Ventura, we, at any rate, know very well that Gioberti retired proudly to his own tent, somewhat in the style of an offended Achilles; but that his Agamemnons, so far from soliciting his return to the Grecian camp, were very glad to leave him there. 5. It is notorious that the scandalous perversion of this unhappy priest preceded the Roman censure, and so could not possibly have been occasioned by it. If, in any other way, Rome must be held responsible for having contributed to that perversion, it can only have been through its ancient and beautiful fault—"l'antica e bella colpa di Roma"—that extreme longanimity which sometimes emboldens ignoble souls to persist in their evil course.

What must strike every attentive observer, is the palpable fact that Dr. Döllinger is either ignorant of or ignores the strong and decided inclination which for twenty or thirty years has manifested itself in Italy, and even in Germany, to a return to the ancient scholastic philosophy. He has the right, of course, to disapprove of this tendency; but he was bound to mention it, and his non-fulfilment of this obligation can only be excused by an ignorance hard to credit in so learned a writer, and one who undertakes to judge of all and everything with a confidence which may often be deemed to border on bold assurance. It is worthy of remark, also, that the signal for this return was given by Naples, so despised for its mental sloth by Dr. Döllinger. Not to mention the "Corso," of which P. Liberatore has lately published a fresh edition, his two treatises, "*La Conoscenza intellettuale*"* and "*Il Composto umano*," are not unknown in Germany; and the five volumes which Sanseverino has already published in Latin of his great work, "*Philosophia Christiana cum Antiqua et Nova comparata*," have had time to attract general attention and admiration. But these works, like those of the authors to whom we have previously alluded, never having been placed on the Index, seem to want the necessary claim to notice in a defence of the "liberties of science." So that modern Italy has at any rate to thank the Roman censorship for having procured the mention of, at least, four contemporary names in Dr. Döllinger's discourse.

It remains for us to examine the signs which have convinced our Professor that the candle of sacred science, removed from other European countries, is about to be set up in Germany.

8.—*Whether or no there be signs that the candle of Science, removed from other Nations, be about to be set up in Germany?*

Dr. Döllinger having proved to his own satisfaction, after the manner stated already, that in the departments of philosophy and sacred science

* This work has been translated into French by the Abbé Emmanuel Sudre, Chanoine honoraire de Reggio et Aumonier de la Société de Marie-Réparatrice.

nothing of any great merit has been produced by Italy, France, or Spain, in the present day, arrives with confidence at this conclusion—that the candle of Theological Science has been removed from its former seats and is now committed to the keeping of the German people. “Greeks, Spaniards, Italians, French, and English, have preceded us,” he observes, “and I may with the Roman poet say,

Illos primus equis Oriens afflavit anhelis,
Nobis sera rubens accendit lumina vesper.

He compares ecclesiastical science to the sun, whose dawn in the region he approaches is the twilight of that which he leaves, and whose meridian splendour in one land is the midnight darkness of the antipodes. It must be confessed that the dark hemisphere of Catholicity would have preferred that sacred science—like all else that is Catholic—should have been no exclusive privilege of this or that people, but have preserved its *super-national* character; which, be it remembered, Dr. Döllinger himself attributes to it at its first establishment. Doubtless, as has been admitted, theological science has flourished more or less at particular periods amongst different nations; but between this and a kind of astronomical alternation of noon-day light and profound darkness, there is some considerable difference. Such a notion would never have occurred to us, but since it has occurred to Dr. Döllinger, who has frankly propounded it before the European world, we non-Teutonic nations conceive we have the right to consult the almanac in order to ascertain whether the time is actually come for us to resign ourself to total darkness and the position of antipodes to the happy German nation, which alone is blessed with the rays of the meridian sun. In justice, however, to Dr. Döllinger, we must premise that he, so far from glorying in this privilege accorded to his country, sees in it a gift of God, accompanied with a corresponding duty incumbent on its recipients, viz., that of enlightening other nations. It is not intended therefore to impute to him any national pride. Modesty does not consist in not recognizing God's gifts, but in referring them to the Supreme Giver, and in fulfilling the duties they impose; but at the same time it is quite conceivable that these gifts may only be a pleasant illusion of the learned Professor—an illusion, nevertheless, which does not rob him of the praise he deserves for bearing these supposed national honours in a spirit of Christian modesty.

It is important to observe that Dr. Döllinger does not by any means pretend that there exists in Germany an actual system of theology corresponding to present needs. On the contrary, he is of opinion that, as respects this desideratum, matters are not much better there than elsewhere. The whole world, he thinks, is in a sort of half-light, or twilight, as it were. Only there is this wide difference—that whereas, for instance, in France, Spain, and Italy, including Rome, the twilight is that of the closing evening, in Germany it is the clear white dawn which is about to brighten into day. Dr. Döllinger, on the whole, appears to prefer prophesying the future to affirming the present, and thinks he can adduce infallible signs in support of the truth of his prognostications. Anyhow the sentence has been pronounced. The *morebo candelabrum tuum*, which in the Apocalypse is a menace, is for all non-German nations an irreversible decree.

But now for the signs or proofs alleged. Let us see if they are as convincing as the learned Professor esteems them to be. The "grace of scientific acuteness, profundity," and much more besides, bestowed by Providence on the worthy German people, is certainly no new gift with which they have been endowed. If, then, these mental qualifications did not avail in past centuries (as Dr. Döllinger himself affirms) to raise the Germans to an equality with other nations in the cultivation of sacred science, why are they all-sufficient at the present day to insure them the pre-eminence? The same may be said with respect to the facility of the Germans for acquiring foreign languages, and for becoming imbued with the national spirit of other peoples, a capacity already alluded to, and, of course, no novel attribute of Dr. Döllinger's countrymen. Moreover, as was before observed, it would be more to the purpose that the scholars should understand the language of the master, and that the rest of Europe should at least manifest an inclination, if not an aptitude, for acquiring the German tongue; or, at any rate, we may add that the Germans should have the habit of writing in foreign tongues. But none of these hypotheses hold good. The Germans are specially attached to their own language, and their Catholic doctors use the Latin even less than do their Protestant divines; while the other European nations, particularly those of Latin origin, do not take to the German tongue, and find it harder to acquire even than English—certainly much harder than French.

We pass on to two other proofs equally valueless. The first is drawn from the Divine promises, the second from an analogy with the lance of Telephus. We must despair of ourselves and of our future, Dr. Döllinger tells us, did we not believe that religious unity is possible, nay, that it certainly will be brought about; equally certain is it, he says, that the German nation is not in a state of decay, but is full of life and vigour—equally certain that the Church has the promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. Why, then, may not German theology be like Telephus's spear, which cured the wound it had inflicted? The German theologians began the schism, kindled the fire of discord and division, and have ever since diligently brought fuel to feed the flames. It is the Germans who have devoted all the resources of their genius to fortifying by scientific bastions those doctrines which have been subversive of the unity of Christendom. These are Dr. Döllinger's own assertions; and therefore, he adds, "German theology has the vocation to reconcile once more the separated confessions in a higher unity." Without desiring to detract in the least degree from the high merits of the German nation, or to dispute its possession of great elements of life and vigour, it is impossible to grant that a restoration to lost unity of faith through its own inherent strength is as surely guaranteed to it, as the promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her is guaranteed to the Church. Dr. Döllinger might, at least, have indicated the source of a confidence somewhat novel, where a special revelation cannot be adduced in its support. The promise which he quotes from the 16th chapter of S. Matthew regards the universal Church, and no particular country has a right to claim an equal certainty either of not losing unity, or of recovering it if lost. The gates of hell have prevailed against many Churches, both in Asia and Africa, once as fruitful in doctrine and in sanctity as any European Churches have been;

where is it written that it is impossible that of these latter none shall succumb? As for the comparison of the lance of Telephus, it forms no argument. It is a poetic fiction, devised to represent something opposed to ordinary fact; and in despite of it, the truth still remains, that wounds made by lances are not doctored and cured by lances, but by plaisters and bandages; and whatever may be the value to be attributed to the *similia similibus* of the homœopathists, to which Dr. Döllinger alludes with reference to this subject, we do not believe that it will ever extend to the cure of a lance wound by a second lance thrust. Besides, the principle, if good for anything, in the case to which it is applied, ought to be quite as applicable to the Greeks seduced by the Photian schism, or to the Asiatics and Africans subjugated by the Arabian impostor. Yet we see small symptoms, after the lapse of centuries, of any self-originating healing processes in those quarters. No, do not let us deceive ourselves, the sick are cured by the healthy; and if, as Dr. Döllinger himself avers, all the science of Germany did not avail to stem the tide of heresy, when it first set in, but help had to be sought from other quarters, what reasonable ground have we to expect more from it now that heresy has established and re-inforced itself in the land for three centuries, with all its pernicious results in the perversion of men's minds. At any rate, the zealous promoters of religious unity ought to stand well on their guard against the danger of themselves making a compromise with error, in the place of bringing back to the truth those that have erred.

Perhaps some less indulgent censor might think he discerned some indication of this peril in the singular notion that "German theology has the vocation to reconcile the separated confessions in a higher unity." We certainly cannot conceive a higher unity than that of Catholicism; and, moreover, we believe that a theologian who should set about seeking such unity would run the risk of corrupting Catholicism itself, by introducing into it elements more or less fundamentally opposed to it.

Dr. Döllinger proceeds to notice as signs of Germany's approaching theological pre-eminence, the unrivalled zeal, diligence, and profundity of thought which his countrymen have displayed in the cultivation of history and philosophy, the two eyes of theology, as he calls them. In these two departments "the Germans," he says, "have become the teachers of all other nations;" then, calling to mind, it would seem, some other branches of knowledge necessary in theology, viz., biblical and patristic exegesis, historical criticism, and so forth, he gives us to understand that in all these requisites Germany holds the same magisterial position.

Three questions occur to us. Is it possible that a new theology, diverse from the old, can supersede it? Supposing this question to be answered affirmatively, in what measure ought the fresh elements—the "stones needed for the new building," to use the Professor's own image—to enter into the construction? Finally, do these elements specially abound and exhibit peculiar perfection in Germany? To attempt a discussion of the two first points would be to embark on a wide ocean out of sight of shore. It will be best, therefore, to pass them by, particularly as they are incidentally disposed of by much which we have already said. We need only, therefore, consider the

third question ; and indeed, if that be answered negatively, it were superfluous to examine the two first.

Undoubtedly many remarkable historical works, particularly during the last thirty or forty years, have emanated from Germany ; moreover, it is readily conceded that the Germans possess two very essential requisites for conducting historical research : patience in investigation, and a certain impartial honesty, quite distinctive of that people ; these noble qualities have, with the abatement of that heterodox fanaticism which impaired their efficiency, once more resumed the ascendancy, so that we owe, in these later times, to the pen of Protestant historians—such as Hurter, Voight, Ranke, Leo—many valuable contributions, not only to the cause of historic truth in general, but to that of Catholicism in particular ; not to speak of Catholic writers who have very commendably illustrated history, and, specially, the middle ages. But there is a long way between this and becoming the “teachers of all nations ;” and the very assumption is only calculated to set other people upon scrutinizing their works and noting deficiencies. Something more, in fact, is needed in a historian than research and candour ; and, while granting the literary merits of certain German historians, it must be observed that not only do heterodox prejudices necessarily hinder Protestants, in Germany, as elsewhere, from perceiving, or, at least, satisfactorily stating the entire truth, but it is not rare to meet with Catholics—and these men of eminence—who manifest an inconsiderate condescension for these very prejudices, and deal with historical subjects in a manner which does not recommend them to the confidence of other nations. Dr. Döllinger himself, in a recent work published by him, supplies, perchance, an example of this tendency.*

But, admitting the justice of all these claims to historical and linguistic criticism, and to patristic and biblical exegesis, do the necessary elements exist for a system of speculative theology worthy to take the place of the scholastic ? We think not. All those branches of knowledge which are subsidiary to theology, which are a noble ornament to it, and often even a needful help, have nothing to say, strictly speaking, to theology in its own peculiar province of speculative science. Theology, in this its proper sense, can without peril be taught and studied both in the schools and in private, independently of any assistance from forensic sciences ; on the other hand, these sciences, when not guided and enlightened by this speculative science, besides exposing the student to serious danger of error, do not constitute him a real theologian. Call him a learned man, an eminent philologist and historian, if you will, but a theologian, in the true sense of the term, he is not ; nor will these sciences alone ever make him such. Theological science indispensably needs the natural instrument of a solid and complete system of philosophy ; and did such exist in Germany, the fulfilment of Dr. Döllinger's fond aspirations, or rather, we might say, of his predictions, might, at least, be considered as within the limits of the possible ; always supposing as its condition that there should be found powerful intellects, who, availing

* “Die Papst-Fabeln des Mittelalters—Fables of the Popes in the Middle Ages.”

themselves of this instrument, should in the present age effect for revealed doctrine and morals what S. Thomas and the other great and holy doctors of the thirteenth century accomplished by the aid of the Aristotelian philosophy.

Dr. Döllinger is so confident in his opinion, that he does not hesitate to aver that the Germans have in philosophy even "become the masters of all other nations." If the pretension as regards history might be thought to savour a little of pride, as respects philosophy it cannot be regarded otherwise than as bordering on the ridiculous. Dr. Döllinger would oblige us by naming even a couple of philosophers, that we may know, at least, what particular philosophy the other nations are to learn from Germany. But he could not name one; for he knows better than we could inform him, that to begin with the monstrous eccentricities of Kant, manipulated and promulgated in a still wilder form by his successors, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, down to the present day, we have nothing but a medley and confusion—such a very Babel of rationalistic studies as has been perhaps unparalleled in any age or country. No system of philosophy, in fact, exists in Germany unless you choose to dignify with that name the arid rationalism and low materialism which are the two systems of opinion actually prevalent in that country. True, these form part of the heterodox teaching; but, besides that Dr. Döllinger makes no distinction between Protestant and Catholic in this matter, speaking of the Germans collectively as a nation, it is with sorrow we call to mind that even the most celebrated Catholic writers who have lately treated of philosophy—Hermes, Günther, and Frohschammer also, if the renown created by pertinacious adherence to his opinion be taken into account—whether it be through the influence of Schelling's and Hegel's principles or the sheer pleasure of devising novelties—have not been able to philosophize without falling into grave errors such as have incurred the censure of the Holy See. Thus, if nothing existed beyond what Dr. Döllinger so highly values, we could not escape the conclusion that, far from exhibiting signs of being about to become the birth-place, or, rather, the abode of revived theological science, there is no country in which philosophical studies are in a more deplorable condition than they are in Germany.

Happily better symptoms are to be met with; and, without attributing to any nation the strange privilege of being the doctor of all the rest, we gladly recognize the fact that a strong and increasing predilection is manifesting itself in Germany for that scholastic science which, as Catholic, is also *supernatural*, and, not being the appanage of any one people, can unite them all as sisters in the unity of one thought under the teaching and guidance of one Church. Suffice it for the present to name a work of Kleutgen, and the brief but substantial writings of the lamented Professor Clemens of Münster, which so early as 1853 gave the first signal of a movement which has since greatly strengthened and widened. The valuable articles which have appeared in that excellent journal, the *Katholik* of Mainz, are hopeful signs in the same direction. But Dr. Döllinger ignores all this; if it be not rather that, being fully aware of it, he desires to dispose of it by a decree, admitting of no appeal, which pronounces the restoration of scholastic philosophy as utterly impracticable. "To attempt," he says, "to confine the theological stream in

its ancient bed, which has long since become too narrow, and, as such, unfit to contain it, is a thing never again to be thought of—*ist nicht mehr zu denken* ;” and he returns forthwith to his favourite theme of biblical exegesis and historical criticism.

But what fruit, it may be asked, will a materialistic and rationalistic generation derive from being saturated with exegesis of a Bible in which they do not believe, and with criticism of a history in which they are resolved to see nothing but what pleases them. If such be the “great gain and the immense progress in science” which is to console Germany for its religious schism—for the century of bloodshed and the two centuries of portentous intellectual aberrations which have been its result—it is their concern who glory in the same ; but Catholic nations are not tempted to envy them. We firmly believe that rationalism can be combated only by rational philosophy, and that it is vain to seek, and impossible to find, a rational philosophy differing substantially from the scholastic ; the only one, in fact, which has ever been professed in the Church. And we are of opinion that, in the present state of men’s minds in Germany, so far from new helps of the positive order being needed, scholasticism, such as it was at its first formation in the thirteenth century, rather than as revived and re-fortified in the sixteenth, is the best suited to the case. For at that period it had to contend with the realism of Gilbert de la Porrée, the nominalism of Roscellin, and the rationalism, whether of Abelard, who maintained that nothing was to be believed which could not be demonstrated by reason, or that of the Arabs of Cordova, who used Aristotle, misinterpreted and perverted by them, as a weapon to assail Christianity. Now the errors which have of late days inundated Europe and specially Germany, do not radically differ from those which were rife in the middle ages. Therefore, instead of torturing our brains with the fruitless and often pernicious attempt to create new sciences and new philosophies, we cannot do better than recur to the *Summa Theologica* and the *Summa contra Gentiles* of S. Thomas.

Such, in conclusion, the writers are persuaded is the true way to restore philosophy and sacred discipline—to return to the great and holy Catholic doctors, without allowing ourselves to be seduced by the fallacious appearances of a presumptuous science which thinks to magnify itself by despising what is great. Finally, with that courtesy which the Roman reviewers so remarkably combine with an uncompromising hostility to erroneous principles, wherever they appear, they desire to withdraw any unnecessary severe expression into which they may have been betrayed against the highly esteemed German people, in the just defence of other nations so unworthily outraged, and in that of Catholic science and truth, the patrimony of all ; begging their German readers to remember, at the same time, that to Dr. Döllinger they really owe any displeasure which these expressions may have caused them, for he has proved the truth of the old saying that a severe censor does less harm to the reputation than an ill-advised and indiscreet panegyrist.

Notices of Books.

A Letter on the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom.

Addressed to the Clergy of the Diocese of Birmingham, by the Right Rev. Bishop ULLATHORNE. London: Richardson.

Sermons on the Reunion of Christendom. By Members of the Roman Catholic, Oriental, and Anglican Communions. Printed for certain Members of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom. London: Masters.

THE authoritative censure of this Association, as the Bishop of Birmingham most truly remarks, "has not been put forth a day before it was needed." That non-Catholics, indeed, should comport themselves inconsistently and absurdly towards revealed truth, is too every-day an occurrence to call for special comment from Rome; but that any Catholics could be duped into countenancing the heretical principle on which the association rests—this was so serious a fact as imperatively to call for ecclesiastical interference. And the Bishop of Birmingham has done excellent service by his exposition and vindication of the Letter addressed to the English Bishops by the Congregation of the Inquisition.

Nothing strikes one more on the surface than the extraordinary readiness of the Unionists to give credit to every kind of childish rumour, where Catholics are concerned. As regards, indeed, this very pronouncement they have lost no time in multiplying these absurdities. "It was disliked," they have told us, "by the Cardinal Archbishop, and by the Bishop of Newport; and was obtained through the urgency of two converts [names being given] on Monsignore Talbot:" one of these converts (by the way) having had no kind of communication on any subject whatever with that Prelate during the whole of his recent visit to England. "Most certain, however, it is," says the Bishop, "that not one of the persons alluded to had anything to do with submitting the case for judgment to the Holy See. That proceeding was conducted in the most direct, canonical, and official mode"—(p. 13). If any one will consider, on the one hand, the minuteness and circumstantiality of the reports thus circulated, and, on the other hand, their absolute and unqualified falsehood, he will see the emptiness of those pretensions so often put forth by the Unionists, to a special and (as it were) privileged acquaintance with what may be called the domestic facts and feelings of the English Catholic body.

Then the Association announces (p. 8) that "it has received the special patronage and benediction" of certain Catholic Prelates. "I have communicated," replies Bishop Ullathorne, "with each of the four bishops whose names have been mentioned, either publicly or privately, as having joined or as favouring the Association, and in each case I have received a formal

and explicit denial of the statement"—(p. 42, note). "Two bishops" of these four, "when spoken to concerning the Association, had merely said, 'I will pray for you;' by which was meant, 'I say nothing about your Association, but will pray for you as individuals'"—(p. 11).

It is quite certain, then, that the promoters of this Association have fallen into a grievous mistake as to the sanction received from Catholic bishops; and this fact alone would make it almost equally certain that they have also misunderstood many replies sent to them by Catholics of lower grade. "It is far from improbable"—we should say it is pretty clear—"that words of mere kindness and courtesy, and such answers to invitations to join it as 'I will pray for you,' have, in the zeal for extending the Society, been interpreted into acceptance of membership. In some instances *this is known to have been the case*"—(p. 8).

But all other misconceptions fall into the shade, when compared with that supreme extravagance of claiming the Holy Father's sanction for their scheme. We do not dream of imputing to them an intention to deceive; but if they have so wildly misunderstood the language of their Catholic fellow-countrymen, they are capable of no less utterly misconstruing words of the Supreme Pontiff spoken in Italian. Yet in this particular case the misconstruction was truly amazing. To suppose that the Holy Father decided a question having a momentous bearing on the conduct of Catholics, on the *prima facie* representation of an Anglican clergyman, without deliberating for one single moment, or consulting one single Catholic adviser, implies, surely, a mind either blinded by intemperate zeal, or simple beyond all ordinary simplicity.

But if anything can be more extraordinary than the credence attached by Unionists to this story, it is the use they have made of it. If a Protestant really believed it (no Catholic could do so) his legitimate inference would be, "See how recklessly and inconsiderately the Pope speaks on serious questions!" But who in the world, except an Unionist, would think of laying stress on these (imaginary) colloquial remarks as conveying the Papal decision of an important question? These writers, indeed, are here peculiarly inconsistent. "The intellectual slavery of extreme Roman Catholics to the Roman bureaucracy"—this is one of their standing complaints. Yet we have them now claiming our submission, not to solemn decrees deliberately and maturely issued, but to a remark made (as they absurdly suppose) in a private conversation with one individual.

However, if we rightly understand the Rev. Mr. Nugee's letter, in the *Weekly Register* of Nov. 26, the whole matter is cleared up. It appears that what he submitted to the Holy Father was a "form of prayer adapted from the Latin Office by the Association." According, then, to this gentleman's own account, nothing whatever was hinted as to the sense in which Unionists use this prayer; or (in other words) as to the one essential and characteristic feature of the Association. Certain Protestants, it was represented to the Pope, had combined to pray that God "would give the Church that peace and unity which is agreeable to His Will;" and because the Pope was much gratified by this intelligence, he is represented forsooth as favourable to that movement, the real character of which we now proceed to describe.

In our number for April, 1864, we treated this question at so great length that little now remains to be done beyond a brief summary of our former argument. The true doctrine of Catholic unity is most admirably drawn out by the Bishop of Birmingham (p. 15 to p. 22), and we earnestly recommend this exposition to our readers' attentive study. As no one can be a Catholic without holding this doctrine, so no one, unless he be self-condemned, can hold this doctrine without being a Catholic. The originators of the Association are not, for the most part, Catholics; and accordingly hold a totally different doctrine on unity: they hold that visible unity and subjection to the Holy See are not involved in the Church's being, but only conducive to her well-being; and that the Photian and Anglican societies are true Churches. Assuming charitably that these gentlemen's ignorance of Catholicism is invincible, we cannot but praise them warmly in that, holding these tenets, they instituted regular and frequent prayer for the Church's visible unity: their false step was the attempting to unite Catholics with themselves in such prayer. No Catholics can pray for the Church's visible and organic unity, because (as they well know) the Church by necessity must always possess it; but they may most acceptably pray that heretics and schismatics be converted to that unity. Here, then, observe, are two totally different objects of prayer. To pray that the Church may obtain visible unity, is one thing: to pray that heretics and schismatics may return to the Church's unity, is a totally different thing; as different from the former as prayer for health is different from prayer for comfort under mental affliction. But the Association in their zeal set about devising a form of expression—a kind of riddle or play upon words—which might stand for either of these two totally different things; and the strange result may be seen in the authorised basis of the Association.

Further, the prayer put forth by Anglicans for this visible unity is a prayer actually based upon heresy; viz., the heresy that a society can be part of the Church without being in subjection to the Holy See. So long as they are praying for unity, their whole prayer must be actually accompanied by one continuous act of (at least material) heresy. When a Catholic, then, professes to unite with them in such prayer, he is not merely uniting himself to a prayer of heretics, but to a directly heretical prayer. That some Catholics may have overlooked this obvious fact, when first asked to join the Association, is intelligible enough; but now that Rome has spoken, if (which God forbid!) one single Catholic, clerical or lay, give any further countenance to the Association, he will be absolutely without excuse.

Now as to its Anglican members. It would appear from some correspondence in the Catholic papers that there are two different camps among them. Some of them, it seems, seek a kind of federal union between the three so-called "branches of the Church;" an union which is to rest on some other basis than that of absolute and unreserved subjection to Rome. These men *only* wish that the largest of the said three societies shall surrender a doctrine, which she regards, not merely as an essential part of the Faith, but as the one corner-stone of the Church's organisation. We refer, of course, to the doctrine, that God has given immediately to the Sovereign Pontiff supreme authority over the whole Church. If this be the object of

their prayer, they may as well cease praying, so far as regards any possibility of their obtaining it.

Others, however, it would appear, are sincerely praying and labouring for corporate union with Rome on the basis of her own doctrine. Now to promote reunion in this sense is simply synonymous with propagating that doctrine of the Pope's supremacy which we have just enunciated. We would ask, then, these excellently intentioned men (as we asked them last April), do you or do you not hold this doctrine yourselves? If you do, then you are formally schismatical in not immediately submitting to the Church; and if you died at this moment you would be eternally lost. But if you do not hold this doctrine, then you perpetrate the unequalled absurdity of praying and labouring for the propagation of a doctrine which you do not yourselves hold.

The appeal of these Anglicans to historical instances of attempted corporate union is simply irrelevant. In all such cases a certain number of leading men, emperor or bishops, profess themselves to be in search of further light. Since the difficulties and the circumstances of these men are much the same, they think it probable that combined consultation with Catholic authorities will be their most hopeful road to truth; while Rome on her side may well judge that certain seasonable concessions in pure discipline may remove from these men many prejudices, and open a wider avenue for the entrance of truth. Then, since the mass of their fellow-countrymen is supposed to repose the greatest confidence in their judgment, the idea of corporate reunion may be far from a wild or improbable dream. But the whole procedure turns on this, that such men profess themselves to be in search of clearer light. Let the Unionists point if they can to one single instance in which the Holy See has lent a favourable ear to any society approaching it in *their* mental attitude. "We hold confidently," they say, "that we are now within the Church's visible pale; but we seek reunion with the Holy See as a means of strengthening, elevating, and instructing our Church." Let them name, if they can, one single instance in which such overtures have been made to Rome, and she has answered in any other language than that of her present decree.

It is hardly necessary to add that Bishop Ullathorne's letter is conspicuous for its learning, its soundness of doctrine, and its accuracy of thought. But we may mention that it will be found to contain all the principal documents bearing on the subject; *i.e.*, not only the official utterances of the Association, but also the original, with a translation, of the late Congregational Decree.

The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England: a Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. By HENRY EDWARD MANNING, D.D.
London: Longman.

WE hail with peculiar pleasure the publication of this pamphlet, not merely for its controversial power, but still more for its exhibition of personal character. Those Protestants who claim especial credit for liberality and enlightenment have of late been making gracious admissions

in favour of Catholicism, simply as such ; but in that very proportion they have intensified their denunciations of the "extreme and bigoted party," which they consider its bane and evil genius. And what is this "extreme and bigoted party" ? It consists of those who are most devotedly loyal to the Pope, and who take, in its most obvious and natural sense, the Church's doctrine that God has constituted him "the teacher of all Christians" (Concil. Flor.). Now, how sensitively even the more advanced of non-Catholics recoil from the true notion of allegiance to the Holy See, one little circumstance will illustrate. It must be confessed, not by all Catholics only, but by all Tractarians, that the Church has very far more claim than the State on her members' loyal and affectionate attachment. (See the remarks in our last number, pp. 378-382.) Since, then, all Catholics know that the Supreme Pontiff is the Church's divinely-appointed ruler, their one reasonable attitude of mind in his regard is a very far more ardent and (as it were) chivalrous loyalty than was due, *e. g.*, to the Stuarts, even on the highest theory of divine right. Yet even the "Union" reviewers are so far from being able to understand what is meant by this loyalty, that in a recent number they brand it with the shameful appellation of "fetish-worship." It can be no matter of surprise, therefore, that one so prominently noted for it as Mgr. Manning should have been an object for the most unmeasured attacks and a victim to the most extraordinary misconceptions. "It would hardly surprise me," he amusingly says, "if I heard that my old friends believed me to have become a cannibal"—(p. 40).

One of these truly monstrous misapprehensions has been that he, and the "extreme party" which he represents, "deny the operations of the Holy Spirit in those who are out of the Church," and hold, accordingly, that every individual who dies while external to her visible unity will certainly be lost. Since this Review has been frequently identified with our author on this very particular, we may be allowed to mention by the way, that no one number of it (we believe) appears without some explicit and unmistakable assertion of the precisely opposite view. Our present concern, however, is with Mgr. Manning ; and we have no hesitation in affirming (for reasons presently to be given) that he has taken a more prominent part than any other English Catholic whomsoever in vindicating and enforcing that very doctrine which he is absurdly accused of denying. Yet how can we be surprised at Protestant mistakes, when even members of the Church display such strange ignorance ? Only last May one disloyal Catholic drew earnest attention, as if to some new discovery, to the condemnation of Quesnel's thesis, that no grace is given externally to the Church. Why no one could accept this thesis without being led into actual heresy ; for he must hold either that heretics and schismatics can be converted without grace, or that they cannot be converted at all. For ourselves, however, we fully think that the great weight both of Catholic authority and of theological reason is in favour of our author's proposition : "That the operations of the Holy Spirit have been from the beginning of the world co-extensive with the whole human race" (p. 7), and that Divine Grace pleads constantly in the heart even of an idolator and an atheist, soliciting him to supernatural truth and goodness. If of an atheist or idolator, how far more in the heart of one who believes in God ; in a

future retribution which shall correspond to man's interior virtue and vice ; in the divine authority of Christianity ; in the Divine Personality of its Founder ! And still stronger does the case become as regards England, if the English be, on the whole, as our author believes, "a baptized people" —(p. 9).

It may be thought, then (since Mgr. Manning's "harshness" is to be somehow maintained), that he judges very severely on a non-Catholic's want of correspondence with the grace offered him, or on the impossibility of invincible ignorance. On the contrary, he says frankly : "Catholic missionaries in this country have often assured me of a fact, attested also by my own experience, that they have received into the Church persons grown to adult life in whom their baptismal grace was still preserved"—(p. 11). And as to invincible ignorance, our own serious doubt is whether his leniency be not carried too far ; or, rather, whether his remarks do not presuppose a greater power of judging on the matter than man possesses (see pp. 12-18). For ourselves, we shrink even from guessing, not only as to individuals but as to classes. God knows the good and evil of man's heart, his opportunities, his powers ; and by God assuredly no injustice will be committed. Only the more thoroughly we were persuaded that invincible ignorance is most widely extended among non-Catholics, or that in innumerable cases God will infuse at the very last some special and efficacious grace—so much the greater would be our heart-felt delight.

But there is a still further difficulty on the salvability of non-Catholics. All who believe in the New Testament must admit that no adult can be saved without the exercise of faith ; and it is a principle of Catholic theology that no one can consistently lead a supernatural life on any other foundation. Now, an opinion has more or less widely prevailed among Catholics, that belief in the Church's infallibility is a strictly necessary condition of true faith ; and one of the ablest among the converts of 1845 (Rev. Wm. Penny) published, as expressing the very ground of his conversion, a work called, "The Exercise of Faith impossible out of the Catholic Church." If this doctrine were true, it would follow, of course, that no non-Catholic adult could be saved, however invincible might be his ignorance of Catholicism ; and the one English Catholic who has exerted himself most actively and successfully for the removal of this difficulty, has been no other than Mgr. Manning. He preached a sermon at Rome containing the same doctrine which he has enunciated in this pamphlet (p. 26), viz., that "the infallible authority of the Church does not enter of necessity into the essence of an act of faith," though it is "the Divine provision for" faith's "perfection and perpetuity, and the ordinary means whereby men are illuminated in the revelation of God." This sermon caused much excitement and discussion at the time, and led many both to look more carefully into the question and ultimately to change their opinion. And, if we may once more refer for a moment to ourselves, in the second number of our new series, we have expressly maintained the same doctrine, and that with a special view to the salvability of non-Catholics. (See note to p. 465.)

All this does not give the notion of a man who ignores his past spiritual life, or is harsh and unkindly towards his former friends. But, says the

Quarterly Review (see p. 45 of this pamphlet), he is in "ecstasies;" he utters "shouts of joy" and "wild peans" on account of the recent judgment of the Privy Council;* and even so excellent a man as Dr. Pusey (p. 6), with a most manifest allusion to Mgr. Manning, says that some "seemed to be in an ecstasy of triumph at this victory of Satan." The author replies by challenging his accusers to cite, if they can, one single passage that bears out their accusation; and the challenge will remain unanswered, because no such passage is to be found. Most different are his real convictions. He thus expresses them:—

"I rejoice with all my heart in all the workings of grace in the Church of England.

"I lament whensoever what remains of truth in it gives way to unbelief.

"I rejoice whensoever what is imperfect in it is unfolded into a more perfect truth.

"But I cannot regard the Church of England as the great bulwark against infidelity in this land"—(pp. 6, 7).

He admits at the same time (p. 22) that the Church of England is a teacher of certain Christian truths, though not of Christian truth as a whole. To the latter claim, of course, he denies her title; and that, not merely because she rejects so much of that truth, but still more because she has destroyed in herself the power of teaching it in its fulness and integrity. For his admirable development of these propositions we must refer our readers to the pamphlet itself, as no analysis can give a fair idea of his argument.

Nothing, surely, can be more reasonable and temperate than all this; but its very reasonableness and temperance make one the more curious to inquire how it is that such a man is called "bigoted" and "violent." Now, so far as this charge is built on the allegation that he is slow in appreciating an opponent's argument or reluctant to make reasonable controversial admissions, whether or no we admit the truth of such charges, at all events, we understand their relevance. But this is by no means the ordinary ground of complaint. By the great majority of his assailants it is implied, as a matter of course, that he is "bigoted" and "violent," simply because he is what they call "extreme;" i. e., because he regards the cycle of infallible truth as larger than it is considered to be by those Catholics who are less sound than he and less docile to the Holy See. If such attacks have any meaning whatever—if they are anything better than wanton railing and invective—they imply the astounding principle that every one who holds a larger body of doctrine as infallibly true is of course more violent and bigoted than one who thus embraces a smaller. On this principle an Ultramontane is always more violent and bigoted than a Gallican; a Gallican than a Tractarian; a Tractarian than an Arnoldian; an Arnoldian than a Unitarian; a Unitarian than a Deist; and a Deist than an Atheist. In Atheism, forsooth, pure and

* This remark occurs in a review of F. Newman's "Apologia." We cannot be surprised at the writer's misrepresentation of Mgr. Manning, for he is conspicuous, even above the common run of Protestant critics, for his unfairness towards the work which is his immediate subject.

simple, is to be found the quintessence of gentleness and of largeness. We, on our side, are very far, of course, from meaning to imply that Mgr. Manning's opinions are for certain true, simply because they are "extreme," and because they imply a greater deference than others to Papal authority. We desire nothing better than that the whole question should be fairly argued out on purely theological and intellectual grounds; being very confident that on such grounds our author's victory is secure. But what we now protest against is the monstrous assumption that he is to be accounted, as a matter of course, a bigot and a narrow partizan, simply because he submits to a larger body of dogma as resting on God's authority, than is accepted by nationalists, by intellectualists, and by liberals.

It is a matter of surprise with many that one who, as an Anglican, was "cautious to excess" and "morbidly moderate" (p. 37), should, as a Catholic, represent an "extreme" school of thought. To us the case presents no difficulty at all; for in each instance he simply held the tenets legitimately appertaining to his position. When he was an Anglican he guided himself by the Prayer-book and Articles; whereas many of his contemporaries revolted against so odious a yoke, even while not seeing their way to abandon the Establishment. In due time he submitted himself to that Church which regards the Holy Father as the divinely appointed teacher of all Christians. In his new position as in his old, he has accepted the tenets of his creed in their obvious sense; and has had therefore no other aim than to embrace that precise view of religion which the Holy See sets forth. When he was an Anglican, several Anglicans who did not fully accept the Anglican position thought him "behindhand and uncatholic;" and now that he is a Catholic, those Catholics who do not fully accept the Catholic position think him bitter and violent. The simple truth is that in each case he has accepted his position, and his critics have not accepted theirs.

But if Mgr. Manning has gone through a great change of opinion, no change whatever has taken place in his exhibition of personal character. We have still to admire the same self-command, composure, unruffled patience, guardedness of expression, gentleness towards opponents, charity, self-forgetfulness. Under imputations most hard to bear—we had almost said under stinging insults—no trace has appeared of bitterness, sarcasm, harshness, or excitement; but he has approved himself the faithful follower of that Divine Person, "Who when He was reviled reviled not again, and when He suffered threatened not."

Discours de Mgr. l'Evêque d'Orléans sur l'Enseignement Populaire. Prononcé au Congrès de Malines, le 31 Août, 1864.

THE name and fame of Mgr. Dupanloup are familiar to every Catholic reader. Wherever there is a good work to be done, or a bold word to be said for God and His Church, the Bishop of Orleans is in the field. He must present even to the appreciation of the worldly eye, one of those commanding energetic characters in whom high abilities co-exist with that firm will and indomitable purpose, which alone avails to secure any marked or durable effect to the choicest gifts of genius and talent. As such, he is an

adversary whom the advocates of infidelity and irreligion cannot condemn, though they may cordially dislike. These natural advantages are enhanced by the Christian virtues which adorn the prelate, and withal by a certain genial simple-heartedness and affectionateness which seem to be national characteristics of the countrymen of S. Francis de Sales; for Mgr. Dupanloup is a Savoyard, and loves his country as all Savoyards do. But it is with the speech and not the man we are now concerned. The momentous subject could not be treated with brevity, and that by one whose heart and soul are filled with its importance; indeed, the Bishop apologised more than once in the most natural manner for his diffuseness, but was as often reassured by the eager encouragement of his auditors. The frequent and enthusiastic applause and the hearty laughter which the unstudied native wit of the orator not seldom elicited, gave ample proof that he held their attention captivated during the whole course of his address.

Mgr. Dupanloup begins by stating four points upon which he considers there is a general agreement. 1. The necessity of popular instruction; 2. Of female education; 3. Of professional instruction, as it is usually designated; 4. Of free competition and liberty.

There is a great cry in the present day for popular instruction. The Bishop replies that he also desires it, and more perhaps than they who raise the cry. Christ said, "*Ecce, docete omni creaturæ.*" It was an idea new to the world: heathen civilization never contemplated the instruction of the people. The Church has laboured at it for eighteen centuries. From the first she applied herself to deliver minds from bondage and brutal ignorance, as she strove to deliver their bodies from slavery and degradation. Well, our aim is still the same. We wish to raise the mind of the youngest child to the highest objects, and develop its mental faculties by exercise. The Bishop proceeds to adduce many instances in the earliest times of the Church's zeal and efforts to promote popular instruction; and amongst them he quotes the words of one of his own predecessors in the eighth century, exhorting his priests to have schools in villages, and even hamlets, open for free instruction in letters. And, be it observed, it is not simple religious education which the Church provided for the poor; she opened her schools at the same time for their gratuitous instruction in *letters*, which are, as here, repeatedly specified.* He contrasts Voltaire's views on this subject with those of Benedict XIII., who, in his Bull of approbation of the Order for instructing the children of the working-classes and of the poor, founded by the Abbé de Salle, says, *Ignorantia omnium origo malorum, præsertim in eis qui fabrilis operæ debiti sunt.* ("Ignorance is the origin of all evils, especially in those who are occupied in mechanical labour.") Voltaire, on the other hand,

* We may here refer to a recent declaration of Pius IX., in a Brief addressed to the Archbishop of Freiburg, and dated July 14, 1864, that religion must ever be the *main* part of popular education, and the rest rather an adjunct than anything else. His words are: "*In eisdem [popularibus] scholis. . . . religiosa præsertim doctrina ita primum in institutione et educatione locum habere ac dominari debet, ut aliarum rerum cognitiones quibus juvenus ibi imbuatur veluti adventiciæ appareant.*"

declares himself against popular instruction. In his correspondence we find this sentiment : "It appears to me essential that there should be ignorant boors" (*des gueux ignorants*). And again, "It is proper that the people should be *guided*, not *instructed*." There are religious persons, certainly, who, during the last forty years, have entertained some prejudices against popular instruction—prejudices now fast disappearing. They are grounded chiefly—1. On the danger of an incomplete education ; 2. On the risk of fostering pride by creating inequalities, where it is not universal ; 3. On defects in the instructors. The remedy is, not to deny instruction, but to remove these evils. Modern material progress, which Mgr. d'Orleans is far from regretting in itself, renders instruction the more indispensable. The danger of material progress lies chiefly in our failing to follow it up by the measures imperatively required to counteract its evil effects. A stronger moral curb is needed to prevent men from succumbing under its temptations. Hence moral and intellectual training is more than ever required. The Bishop does not approve of obligatory instruction ; but the cry for it mainly arises from a certain vague appreciation of this truth. Moreover, the unlettered workman will never rise above the lowest handicraft ; progress and competition are the order of the day : we must move on, too, when the whole world is moving on, only it must be with the light of the Gospel in our hands. Christian morality and instruction—these are our safeguards : unless these are generally diffused, in ten years we shall have a working-class divided into *instructed* workmen who are *discontented*, and *ignorant* workmen who are *indigent*.

Strongly impressed with this urgent necessity, the Church is everywhere multiplying her religious congregations devoted to popular education. To our adversaries, then, we reply, we desire instruction for the people more than you do. You had no school in Gaul at a time when the Church had already founded numerous schools. At this present moment we have a school even in Thibet, where you have none.

We have no space to analyze, even in the briefest manner, the different topics discussed in this able speech. Bare allusion must suffice. The Bishop desires professional instruction, but disapproves of its being given at school, as interfering with the regular course of study, while it fails of its special object, 'since the knowledge required in a profession cannot be imparted theoretically. It must be learned by practice ; but along with this practice and during apprenticeship, suitable instruction may be advantageously given at special hours. He has some brothers of Christian doctrine in his diocese, who, after superintending their own school for six hours in the day, give instruction of this character for several hours more in the evening to young mechanics, which does not prevent their rising at four the next morning. Good schools for adults, conducted in a Christian spirit, are what is most needed everywhere for the working-classes. Good professional instruction is instruction prolonged after boys have begun to work at a trade ; the instruction, of course, being adapted to their employment and condition.

The adversaries of the Church affect to desire competition and liberty. The Bishop really desires it. He considers the law of 1850 to have been a great boon. If he did not recoil from competition then, in the midst of the

storm, assuredly he does not dread it now. Competition is a law of nature, and of modern society ; and he is not afraid of modern society. We must march with our age, not to be corrupted by it, but to save it from corruption. Certainly he does not desire that there should be schools conducted by the irreligious, but he willingly accepts lay competition ; and he is experimentally convinced that religious teachers will never lose by the comparison, or the interests of the community suffer by a just emulation. As a class, the lay teachers have considerably improved since 1848, when M. Thiers could say that there were 40,000 schoolmasters in France who were so many anti-clerics, and preachers of atheism and socialism. For some of these schoolmasters the Bishop even entertains the highest respect, but attempts are being made to turn the heads of lay teachers by telling them they are the reformers of the human race, and the preceptors of the sovereign (viz., the people).

As for gratuitous instruction, it is well known that the Church has always been quite the reverse of opposed to it ; but it must be remembered that no instruction can be purely gratuitous. Some one must pay for it, and the Church would have the rich pay for the education of the poor, while the democrats, by their pretended gratuitous system, would lay it as a charge upon all, since the funds for the payment of teachers must of course be derived from taxation. And who can teach either with the self-sacrifice or at so cheap a rate as the Church, with her religious bodies willing to devote themselves to the work from the purest and most disinterested of motives ? *The best teaching, by the best teacher, on the best terms*—this the Church provides ; but her enemies will have none of it, and are ready to expend any money rather than have it.

Obligatory instruction he considers (1) as an impossibility. In fact, it is almost nominal where it exists. In principle he is utterly opposed to it, as being an invasion of family and parental rights ; and he regards it, moreover, as a snare. Where, however, the communal life exists in vigour it may possibly, and he has heard actually does in Germany, produce few inconveniences, because the authority in such cases resides in the association of fathers of families ; but in France and Belgium it is not to be thought of. It would be accompanied with such practical difficulties as to render the scheme preposterous ; and the Bishop draws a ludicrous picture of an army of inspectors visiting every hamlet to enforce this infant conscription. (2.) It is an hypocrisy. Because, in the great majority of cases, to compel school attendance is to compel attendance at the state school, be it good or bad. It is not instruction our adversaries desire ; it is attendance at a school where religion is not taught. For this is what they loudly advocate, the separation of secular from religious instruction. It is impiety, not instruction, they desire to render obligatory. (3.) It is an inutility. Here the Bishop adduces statistics which prove the immense progress made of late years in popular instruction. Why devise costly and vexatious measures to promote a movement which goes of itself ?

The remainder of Mgr. Dupanloup's admirable harangue is occupied with the fundamental question, "What part do the school and the schoolmaster play in society ? and What ought to be the place assigned to religion in the school ?" In a masterly manner he shows (1) that the effect of mere primary

instruction, considered simply as instruction and apart from religious training, is most grossly overrated. At the most it does but supply to the child three mechanical instruments—reading, writing, and arithmetic. The primary school, so far from being the reformer of the human race, is but the parents' assistant in communicating this elementary instruction; nothing more. It is raised to a higher and more sacred office only by becoming the auxiliary of religion. It is thus only that the school becomes holy, and the schoolmaster respectable. Otherwise, it is a mere machine, and the master but a teacher of the alphabet. He proceeds to show that religion, instead of having less place in instruction, ought to have more. He points out the different ways in which it is endeavoured to thwart the influence of religion; by conditions imposed on the opening of schools; by certificates of capacity for directing them; by inspections; by examinations; and the finger of the State in all of them. Out of 21,000 girls' schools, 14,000 are kept by religious, and now the democrats are raising a cry for female education, as if all had to be begun afresh; and diplomas are to be required of all. Nuns are to have diplomas for teaching sewing and the alphabet! Soon we shall have diplomas for nurses! But the object is palpable. The democrats laugh in their sleeves at these pompous requirements, but they think to discourage the nuns, who will shrink from a public examination, on the indecorum of which in their case M. Thiers eloquently descanted in 1850.

In an equally masterly style the Bishop shows how this system of perversion may be traced in the journalism and popular literature of the day; with a like power he exposes the pretence alleged for separating instruction from religion, viz., because religious instruction is in the hands of the priests, and the priests, with the Pope at their head, are opposed to our modern Constitutions. After showing the absurdity of this pretext in its practical application, he asks, "Is there any question of democracy, parliamentarianism, or the principles of '89 in the teaching of children from eight to twelve years old? Separate religion from the school, say the pseudo-liberals, lest you teach intolerance; be frank, and say, lest you teach religion." By the journalists, however, he means only a certain class; little Messieurs (but of 25 years often), who, having never entered a college, a manufactory, or a church, go, cigar in mouth, to their club, and scribble pages about popular education, and supposed wants and dangers. "Ten or a dozen of these little gentlemen are busy writing now-a-days that religion and the school must be separated. Meanwhile what voice arises to teach, console, and encourage the toiling million? The voice of religion. Silence that voice, take away from these poor men the Crucifix, the Tabernacle, Religion, as you gentlemen of the press would do, and earth would become one scene of horror, of unrestrained vice, and unimaginable misery." Then follows an animated picture of what religion has done and is doing for the reformation of humanity.

We must content ourselves with quoting, in conclusion, one of those amusing sallies, with which the Bishop relieves, while illustrating, the most serious topics. After showing that the Church alone has the secret of self-sacrifice, he tells these so-called liberal gentlemen philosophers that he has a proposition to make to them which cannot but be agreeable. He invites them to put forth the following advertisement in their journals—"Wanted

from 400,000 to 500,000 heroes of both sexes to teach prayer and the alphabet to dirty children on these terms—that the said heroes and heroines shall practise chastity, patience, and perseverance, and shall work ten hours a day for 30 sous a head ; receiving calumnies in compensation for deficiency of salary, and pledged to denying themselves even innocent pleasures.” “Be so good,” he adds, “as to enter this advertisement next week, on the 4th page of your journals, and I will pay for it” (Prolonged laughter).

Vie de Madame Louise Mallac, Religieuse du Sacré Cœur de Jésus.
Seconde Edition. Paris : Dupuy, 1863.

THIS narrative of a life too short, not for its possessor, but for those whom her virtues edified, is written, it would seem, by one of the religious of the order in which Louise Mallac spent ten of the twenty-nine years she dwelt on earth. She was one of those exceptional souls which P. Ravignan, in his “*Vie Chrétienne*,” has described ; innocent, simple, child-like, with but one marked inclination, divine love ; occupied alone with the one desire of pleasing God ; marvellously ignorant of their own spiritual loveliness, and unaffectedly esteeming themselves as nothing. These rare flowers of grace remind us (he observes) of the privilege of Immaculate Mary, and did we not know that it was reserved for her alone, we could almost persuade ourselves that they had not sinned in Adam. Save some little infantine *espérgeries*, which no one whose subsequent life had not been as blameless as her own would have remembered as sins ; and a slight temporary relaxation in fervour, owing to intercourse with some young relatives when she was about fifteen, and which at a hint from her pious mother she deplored instantly with tears of contrition, the biographer of Louise has nothing to record of her fair life before it was irrevocably consecrated to God, but what might become the youth of those children of benediction in whom the ever-increasing graces of sanctity were never tarnished by the breath of sin.

In 1852 she began her noviciate in the order of the Sacred Heart, with the full concurrence of her only surviving parent, but to the deep disappointment of a fond brother, who, although he had not lost his faith, had given up the practice of his religious duties, and who could therefore find no consolation in his heart for the loss of the sister who had been the joy of his home. It was one of those cases over which Protestants mourn so piteously. The happy family circle was broken up ; she who was the angel of the house, its light and its love, was gone. The effects on M. de Mallac's mind, in losing the example and society of this idolised sister, whose piety was the remaining link which kept him back from thorough ungodliness, were likely to be most disastrous. Louise Mallac's life is a triumphant answer to all such plausible pleas as the idolisers of domestic felicity so often put up against the religious vocations of the most cherished members of the family group. Louise, in religion, became the apostle of her family ; and we have in her an example of the way in which natural affection, when sublimated by spiritual, is not only surpassed in kind and intensified in depth, but is made fruitful of benefits it never could have bestowed in its own simple and untransformed character.

We often read of saints treading human affection under foot ; and worldly souls have little relish for the spectacle ; they misunderstand as well as recoil from it. They may see here the true interpretation of such acts, in an example less likely to repel them, because in this case the tender family love was never even in appearance broken. A year afterwards Louise's pious mother followed her into the Convent of Conflans, and then, by-and-by, the young Joséphine, her sister, joined them ; and M. Mallac, in his desolation, lamented that vocations seemed contagious in his house. His own was to follow in time. Louise made the offering of her life for his conversion : it was accepted. Nothing can be more touching than the simple account given of the way in which her sufferings, pang by pang, purchased for him grace, and, finally, full correspondence thereto. The sacrifice, however, was not complete till, as she closed her eyes and slept the sleep of the just, her brother formed the resolve, hitherto vehemently combated when she had pressed it upon him, of becoming a Jesuit. She died on the 23rd of January, 1862, and on the 28th of that same month he had already generously disembarrassed himself of every earthly care, and had fixed his day for entering the noviciate of the Society of Jesus.

Meditations on the Essence of Christianity, and on the Religious Questions of the Day. By M. GUIZOT. Translated from the French under the superintendence of the author. London : Murray. 1864.

M. GUIZOT is a man who, if he fails to excite enthusiasm, is sure to command respect. As a politician we did not like him ; but of his honesty of purpose we never entertained a doubt ; and if in his political creed he has erred, we are ready to give him credit for the same invincible ignorance which we are desirous to ascribe to him in higher matters. But he has now laid aside politics, as politics have laid him aside. To quote his own words :—"I have passed," he says, "thirty-five years of my life in struggling on a bustling arena for the establishment of political liberty and the maintenance of liberty as established by law. I have learned in the labours and trials of this struggle the real worth of Christian Faith and of Christian Liberty. God permits me, in the repose of my retreat, to consecrate to their cause what remains to me of life and of strength. It is the most salutary favour and the greatest honour that I can receive from His goodness." These words do honour to M. Guizot, and the more so as it is plain, from much that appears in the course of his "*Meditations*," that religion is not merely embraced as a resource, on the failure of the stirring interests of life, but has ever had a large place in his affections, and a strong hold on his convictions, even amidst the peculiarly distracting cares of public life. M. Guizot is a Christian ; and the volume before us, which is but an instalment of a larger work, contains a defence of Christianity against the infidelity of the day. As such, the author is one who, as not against us, is with us. His object is not controversial ; so far from it, he is avowedly desirous to make abstraction of differences, and unite on a common ground, that of the main dogmas of Christianity, for their vindication against

unbelievers. We need scarcely observe that such common ground, in the sense in which he understands it, and as indicated by the very title of the work, "*Meditations on the Essence of Christianity*," does not exist; but there is a sense in which it is true that we have much in common; since, with us, he holds certain elementary Christian truths, albeit with more or less of depth and distinctness, as may be supposed, while he errs (so far, at least, as appears from the work before us) mainly by defect rather than by assertion. As is well known, M. Guizot belongs to the class of "orthodox" Protestants in France, who still cling to an objective creed and struggle against the rapid encroachments of rationalism. His plan in the "*Meditations*" is chiefly to show that the instincts of the human heart correspond with the dogmas of revelation, and, moreover, that certain analogies in nature and reason add to their *à priori* probability. These points are often well and forcibly stated, rather in a broad than in any detailed form; not that anything very new or striking has been said on the subject, nothing, at any rate, which Catholics have not seen demonstrated with more fulness and depth elsewhere, but, viewed in connection with the quarter from which the work emanates, and the disadvantages under which, even in its best form, Protestantism labours, it is a meritorious production, and will be read by those who would not look into a Catholic publication.

As might be expected, the author is strongest where the truths of natural religion are concerned; when he touches on Christian doctrine he is less at home, more sketchy and unsatisfactory. His chapter on the Incarnation, for instance, is singularly feeble. Maintaining the Divinity of our Lord, it is remarkable how little he apprehends its objectivity, furnishing thus only one additional to the many examples of the little grasp or realization of the great Mysteries of the faith, which is possessed in general even by Protestants who in words profess them, nay, more, who desire in heart to embrace them. Our hope is that they are often loved better than they are apprehended. When M. Guizot turns to the bearing of Christian truth on man himself, and its subjective aspect, he is more at his ease. For the Bible as a whole he has a deep and instinctive reverence. He conceives that the fact of its inspiration, generally speaking, approves itself directly to the mind. As respects form, language, and accuracy in any matter not regarding God's dealings with the soul of man, he believes the writers to have been left to themselves. M. Guizot is fond of general views, or, rather, he has a way of accepting truth in the general, while in detail he shrinks from its application or acceptance. This attitude of mind results, in a measure, from his Protestantism, but we believe that it also belongs to the peculiar constitution of his own mind. In his larger statements he is much truer and more orthodox than when he descends to some detail, where he often contradicts himself, and abandons his hold of the truth which he has before asserted. Compare, for instance, his sketch of Moses' mission, which he accepts as Divine, and his account of the giving of the Law, of which he fully credits the miraculous history, with the contradictions occurring in the course of a few pages. "Moses never speaks in his own name, &c.; God alone speaks and commands"—(p. 188). Turning to the previous page, we meet with this assertion:—"When we consider the Mosaic legislation, we find that in everything

which concerns the external forms or practices of worship, the ideas of Egypt have made great impression upon the mind of the Lawgiver, and the frequent use he has made of Egyptian customs and ceremonies is not less visible." To qualify this passage, he adds, "But far above these institutions and these traditions, *which seem not seldom out of place or incoherent*, soars and predominates constantly the *Idea* of the God of Abraham and of Jacob, of the God One and Eternal, of the true God." This opposition of ideas to facts contains the germ of those unbelieving systems which M. Guizot has earnestly set himself to combat. Yet we are firmly persuaded that such observations, scattered throughout, by no means fairly represent the author's *animus* towards Revelation, which is positive, not negative. To prove, for instance, that he does not consciously lean to the theory of "the Idea," as held by modern rationalists, we have but to quote his own words in the concluding page of this volume. "No better success" (he has been speaking of the attempt to explain the miracles of Jesus by natural causes) "will attend the new attempt that has in these days been made, and which consists in placing the Ideal in the place of the Supernatural, and in elevating religious sentiment upon the ruins of the Christian faith. This is doing either too much or too little."

But it is difficult to read the Old Testament with any true intelligence save in connection with the New. Of the typical meaning of the worship and history of the Israelites, M. Guizot as yet has manifested no conception; while even as regards the prophecies of the Messiah to come, he is disposed to admit, or, at least, to contend only for, the broadest and most obvious of the number. Believing, as we do, that as a whole the Old Testament will remain a dead letter to such as accept not the mystical sense, the interpretation of which is to be found in its fulness only in the Mystical Body, we are not surprised at M. Guizot's deficiencies, obscurities, or misconceptions on this head, and have less heart to point them out where there is so much which deserves commendation.

We look with interest to the future volumes, and cannot but hope that so candid a mind as M. Guizot's will, by a deeper examination, be led nearer and nearer to the fountain of truth, and that his sincere labours in defence of our common Lord will, by Him who leaves no good work, no service of love unrequited, be rewarded with increased light and the grace of conversion.

Unity and the Rescript. A Reply to Bishop Ullathorne's Pastoral against the A. P. W. C. By RICHARD FREDERICK LITLEDALE, M.A., LL.D.
London: Palmer. 1864.

WE did not receive this pamphlet till we had dispatched our notice of Mgr. Manning, or we should have been tempted to quote it in that notice. Dr. Littledale calls Mgr. Manning "a master of the art of suppression and mis-statement" (p. 5), and thinks himself "justified in supposing that the astuteness which was sufficient to mislead Cardinal Patrizi was also effectual in concealing its own working from Bishop Ullathorne" (p. 10). Why, here is Mr. Kingsley over again: the same thing in substance, but

different in shape, and directed against a different object. Is it to be endured, that language of this sort shall be uttered concerning a grave ecclesiastic, and that without so much as the profession of proof?

As Dr. Littledale has chosen to write in this un-Christian way, we certainly shall not take the trouble to answer his arguments. We may say, however, generally, that they are weak in the extreme.

The Apostleship of Prayer: a Holy League of Christian Hearts united with the Heart of Jesus, to obtain the Triumph of the Church and the Salvation of Souls; preceded by a Brief of the Sovereign Pontiff, Pius IX. By the Rev. H. RAMIÈRE, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the latest French edition, and revised by a Father of the Society. London: Richardson. 1864.

THIS work was originally designed to explain and recommend the principles of the association whose name it bears: "*L'Apostolat de la Prière*." It is now twenty years since this "league of Christian hearts" was first formed in a religious seminary, in order to assist, by united intercession, in the conversion of souls and the promotion of Christ's kingdom. For some time the association was little known, being almost confined to religious communities. Within the last few years, however, it has been rapidly and widely extended, owing much to an improved organization, to the spiritual privileges conferred upon it, and to its being made known through a monthly periodical, *Le Messager du Sacré Cœur*. It is now spread through the whole Church, and in every quarter of the world. In the first six months of the year 1864, half a million of certificates of association were distributed beyond the limits of France.

The treatise now translated has doubtless contributed much to this great development. Its circulation has been extensive. Three large editions have been sold almost as soon as published: it is from the fourth and most complete edition that the English translation has been made. It has been also translated into German and Italian.

The design of the treatise is simple and unpretending, but, in the hands of a writer of philosophical mind, deeply imbued with Catholic theology, it has assumed the character of a complete and solid work on Intercessory Prayer. F. Ramière was not content without treating the subject thoroughly, and grounding the sentiments and practices he recommends, on a basis of sound reasoning and Catholic dogma.

In a very valuable and thoughtful Introduction he dwells on that great mystery, the actual spiritual condition of the world, as contrasted with the known will of God and the infinite efficacy of the Saviour's Passion. How is this seeming contradiction to be accounted for? An answer sufficient to silence our objections is, indeed, supplied by the consideration of the unsearchableness of God's judgments. But there is another, which is, at least, the true practical answer, suggested by the words of the Apostle which form the groundwork of the treatise. S. Paul desires that Christians should pray

for all men, and gives, as a reason for their doing so, that God wills the salvation of all, and that Christ died for all. That is, God has made the carrying out of His own work dependent on our co-operation. This, indeed, is but in accordance with a law that pervades the whole of His dispensations of nature and of grace. God would have all men to be saved, but their salvation is to be brought about by the instrumentality of His Church; not only by the Apostolic ministry and Sacraments, but by a means which is within the reach of all, and in which all ought to take a part—Prayer.

On this foundation the treatise proceeds: showing first the assured efficacy of the Apostolate of Prayer from the power of intercession, especially as connected with the doctrine of Grace and the promises of Christ; from the influence of association in the supernatural, as well as the natural order; and specially from the power obtained by union with the Heart of Jesus. A second part treats of the advantages of such united prayers to the individuals who practise it, to the Church, and to the world, and the peculiar need for it which exists at the present time. The mode of carrying out these principles in our devotions, and by the intention given to all the actions of our daily life, with some account of the organization of this particular association, concludes the work.

It will be observed that but a small portion of the treatise applies exclusively to the *Apostolat*. In general, the arguments and suggestions bear on the subject of intercessory prayer in itself. And, excellent as such associations are, it is still true that the Church is the great league for united intercession, in which it is the duty of every Catholic to take part. In this point of view, F. Ramière's treatise is calculated to be of inestimable value to the whole Church, by increasing the earnestness of our intercessions, and carrying the spirit of them into every part of our life.

Two features strike us particularly in this work: its thoroughly dogmatic character, and the tone of confident hope which pervades it. As a specimen of the former, we would refer to the manner in which the doctrine of our union with Christ is treated: His dwelling in us and making Himself one with us by the Blessed Sacrament, so that our prayers are His prayers, while the Holy Spirit ever prays and intercedes in us. The questions of the efficacy of the prayers of those who are not in a state of grace, and of the causes of the inefficacy of our prayers, whether existing in ourselves, or in those for whom we pray, are also treated with great theological exactness. But this dogmatic character is combined with a most practical and devout spirit. The treatise recalls those words of Father Faber, where he speaks of "a certain sunniness and lightheartedness observable in those who devote themselves to intercession." The hopefulness of the author with respect to the future of the Church is in entire accordance with faith in the unlimited power of prayer. His views on this subject have been developed more at large in an important treatise on the Hopes of the Church.

We will not venture to cite the letter of the Abbé Gratry in recommendation of the Apostleship of Prayer, lest, as he himself fears, his expressions of admiration should seem exaggerated. But we concur in the substance of his judgment as to the great value of the work, its appropriateness at the present time, its comprehensive reasoning, and its theological solidity.

We have not compared the translation with the original ; but we can have no doubt of its substantial accuracy, and it certainly possesses the good quality of being a very readable book.

The Life of Saint Anthony of Padua, Friar-Minor, 1196-1231. Translated from the French. London : Richardson. 1864.

THIS is the first time, with the exception of the short biography contained in Alban Butler's "Lives of the Saints," that we have possessed a detailed history of this marvellous saint. Nevertheless, we feel not unfamiliar with him, although he is generally little known in this country except by three circumstances :—1. The pictures representing him receiving the Infant Jesus into his arms, which connect him with that sweet devotion ; 2. The very general belief—may we not add, the very frequent experience ?—of the efficacy of his intercession in recovering lost articles ; 3. The prodigy recorded of his sermon to the fishes. We have now his wonderful life pleasingly related in this little volume, a translation from a French version of a Flemish life written by a Belgian Friar-Minor Recollect, in 1854, but reading like an original work. Few materials remain for any detail of the private life of S. Anthony of Padua, or for a minute picture of his interior. His sanctity is mainly exhibited in his heroic life of self-sacrifice, in its powerful influence on his age, and in the marvels of which he was the agent or subject. Yet it is singular to observe that this saint reckons amongst those who may pre-eminently be termed familiar and friendly saints, whom we confidently invoke even in what may be called trifling temporal matters. That such speciality should be assigned to one who was so magnificently raised above the ordinary circumstances of common life, would be simply unaccountable had we merely natural inclination or caprice to explain such selection. Catholic instincts, acting by some unseen influence, can alone account for the delightful variety of the feelings with which we regard our blessed patrons.

We confidently expect that this little book will extend and deepen the already favourite devotion to this great saint ; and we would especially recall to mind the fact that S. Anthony was a Portuguese by birth, and that no Catholic country, perhaps, dominated as it is by an irreligious government, stands in greater need of the intercession of the saints, and prayers of the faithful, than does the native land of Ferdinand Bullones. We may add that the book is published for the benefit of the Franciscan Orphanage at Woodchester.

Philocalia: Elementary Essays on Natural, Poetic, and Picturesque Beauty.
By WILLIAM PURTON, M.A. London : Whittaker. 1864.

THE work before us contains only a dissertation on natural beauty, the author having reserved the poetic and the picturesque for a future volume. We can hardly be surprised at the length to which he found his subject expand, seeing that he has favoured us, in connection with his theory

with a system of theology of which the parentage or, at least, the relationship is patent. We are driven almost to regret the days when science and philosophy were treated in complete separation from religion, and in affected ignoring of its truths. Inconsecutive minds, at the least—and they abound—failed to draw the conclusions involved in the erroneous principles, but in the present day we are treated by every dealer in philosophical ware with a *rifacciamento* of the Christian Revelation to fit his scheme. The effects of this proceeding in un-Christianising those who have not the anchor and light of the true faith are obvious; we have yet, we fear, to see its general result on the unsettled Protestant mind of this country.

The thesis maintained by the author is, that natural beauty is the exhibition of the love and mercy of God in the visible creation. He asks how we are taught to distinguish beauty from deformity, good from evil; and he replies that man has obtained the knowledge of good and evil by the "process" styled in Scripture the "fall of man." Of course the tree of knowledge, the serpent, the devil, to whose personal existence Mr. Purton is extremely opposed, are all discarded, and become in his hands a mere allegory. He adduces Middleton in support of this view, who says that the Scripture account, literally understood, shocks the principle of probability. In a note he apologises for quoting a writer of such latitudinarian principles, a proceeding which seems a little superfluous, considering the breadth of his own views; but he conceives that the odium incurred by that divine was not on account of his opinions with respect to the fall of man, but in consequence of his attack on patristic theology, which offended the High Church party at Cambridge. Middleton maintained that if the genuineness of the miracles related by the Fathers were admitted, no line could be drawn between them and those of the Church of Rome, a reasoning which appeared so conclusive as to lead to the temporary conversion to Catholicism of the historian Gibbon, and in our day, adds Mr. Purton, to similar results. The writer opines that sin was impossible when man was necessarily without moral sense, not knowing good and evil; in fact, that he knows good, and can only know it, by knowing evil. Sir Thomas Browne says, Virtue (abolish vice) is an idea. "It is, moreover," adds Mr. Purton, "an idea of which we could form no conception." He quotes a conceit from Kingsley's "Yeast," in which a peasant is made to ask what Adam and Eve in their paradisaical innocence would have thought if all the devils had come and played their fiends' tricks before them; the reply being that "they would have seen no more harm in it than there was harm already in themselves; and that was none. A man's eyes can only see what they have learnt to see." The converse, he argues, must be true. "Learning comes by knowledge, and knowledge is of good and evil." Can our author possibly mean to assert that good is known only by its contrast; for instance, that we should not know that sugar was sweet unless we had the experience of bitter, or, in the moral world, know the sweetness of love unless we had felt the bitterness of hatred? It would certainly appear that such is his creed; and so sin and suffering were the necessary road to the knowledge of good, before which the first man had but "divine instincts."

We have no intention of following out the author's theories. They are

expanded in an appendix "On Crime and Morals," where a large amount of Christian doctrine, not in accordance with Mr. Purton's notions of probability, is explained away as so much metaphor, and their room supplied by the substitution of conceptions of his own, which, however satisfactory to himself, are not a little calculated to shock the general notions of probability entertained by ordinary men. We do not see but that the remaining truths of Revelation might be as easily disposed of by the same process.

We note this little work, not for its intrinsic merits, but as being symptomatic of the line which the emancipated Protestant mind of this country is taking, and has lately acquired a claim to take unrebuked.

Fortune's Football: A Historical Tale. By MRS. OGDEN MEEKER. 4 Vols. London: Newby. 1864.

WHEN we say that we consider these volumes superior in interest, power, and finish, to the former works of the accomplished writer, we feel that we are giving expression to no light encomium. For the pen that could draw such masterly portraits as those of Cardinal Wolsey and Sir Thomas More, and depict with equal felicity and life-like touch the denizens of the low Irish courts of London, must be acknowledged to possess much versatile skill, and not a little masculine vigour. Mrs. Meeker, indeed, has proved herself to be no ordinary novel writer. Her mind and powers are eminently historical; and the plan of a fictitious narrative has been chosen by her only for the purpose of presenting the conclusions of her reading and research in a more popular and dramatic form. We say research, for the author of "Fortune's Football" has not trusted the most esteemed historians for her materials, but has gone to original sources, and constructed her story out of the results of her accumulated gleanings. The reader has therefore the satisfaction of knowing that he is perusing no mere work of fiction, but a narrative of real events, faithfully represented, though conveyed in an imaginative form, and garnished with details of perils, sufferings, and adventures which, while they have a thrilling and even sensational interest, in the best meaning of the term, embody, nevertheless, the plain, unvarnished facts of history.

The scene of the present work is laid in the reign of Elizabeth, a period in which we English Catholics have a sort of domestic interest of the most painful kind: for it was a time of desolation, sorrow, and woe to every faithful household in the land. It was a time, not merely of peril and loss, but of sorest trial and distress, to hundreds of pure and devoted souls, who had to mourn, not the impoverishment alone, but the disgrace of many a noble house, and not the death or banishment only, but the degradation and the fall of those they loved best on earth.

The hero and heroine of the story may be said to be the unhappy Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, and the sweet Annie Dacre, whose respective wrongs and sufferings are wrought out with great power and pathos; but they divide the attention of the reader almost equally with two other chief characters, young Rookwood of Euston Hall—whose reception of Queen Elizabeth at his ancestral mansion, and the infamous treatment he received

at the hands of his royal guest, form one of the most striking incidents in the book—and the high-souled Spanish maiden, Beatrice. Then we have Edward Arden of Parkhall (of whom mention has been made in our second Article) and his crack-brained son-in-law, John Somerville; the martyrs Campion and Southwell; the sly deceiver, Elizabeth Croft and the noble-hearted Margaret Ward; Topcliffe, the priest-hunter, Fox, the martyrologist, Dr. Dee, the astrologer, and many others well known to fame or infamy. With these figure, of course, all the great historical personages of Elizabeth's court; the "strong-minded" queen herself, with all a woman's vanity, yet lacking a woman's heart; and (need we add?) another queen—a woman indeed—whose name seems destined through all time to evoke feelings the most opposite, of love or hate, devotion or resentment, the hapless Mary of Scotland. The story abounds in spirited descriptions, among which we may instance the kindling of the beacons along the English coasts as the Armada came in sight; and what we may call the backgrounds of the several scenes are painted with much picturesque effect. The defect of the work—for, as reviewers, we must needs be critical—is in the management of the story: the dialogue is well sustained, the movement never flags, the colouring is brilliant yet never overlaid, there are many passages of great freshness and beauty, but looked at as a whole, it is rather a succession of vivid pictures than a skilfully contrived and patiently elaborated plot. This, we say, is the effect as a whole: and yet we can hardly signalize it as any fault of composition; for if the reader's anxiety is not kept ever on the stretch for the coming catastrophe, the interest of the narrative is never allowed to falter, the events move easily and naturally onward, there are incidents which for the time keep his breath as it were suspended, as in the search for Father Weston at Euston Hall, and his escape from the Tower, and over all there breathes a spirit of tenderness and purity which holds the mind captive in a pleasing thrall.

We cordially commend the work to our readers' notice; they will not be disappointed.

The Canadians of Old. By PHILIPPE AUBERT DE GASPÉ. Translated by GEORGINA M. PENNÉE. Quebec: Desbarats. 1864.

A STORY illustrative, as its title imports, of old Canadian manners. M. de Gaspé is, as he tells us himself, a septuagenarian, born only eight-and-twenty years after the conquest of La Nouvelle France, at a time when the traditions and customs of the French settlers must have still been fresh. Tales of this character stereotype features which history cannot chronicle, and render a service which in the absence of contemporary memoirs and literature, is not to be undervalued. The narrative, which is rather designed as a vehicle for this pictorial object, than directed to the excitement of any thrilling interest, is not wanting, however, in spirit or movement. Much credit is due to the translator. The work is rendered into good flowing and

easy English, and bespeaks not only a perfect knowledge of both tongues, seldom possessed by those who undertake the task, but a power of thinking out the ideas of one tongue in another, still more rare, combined with much freedom of style and mastery of language.

Sursum ; or, Sparks Flying Upward. By the Rev. H. A. RAWES, M.A.
London : Knowles. Dublin : Duffy.

WE are unable to do more than give a brief notice of this book, which we commend with confidence to our readers. Its literary merits seem to us of a high order, and yet these merits are its least. It is marked by great clearness of conception, and great purity of language. The poems have one excellence which seems to us as vital to real poetry as it is rare to find, and that is a facility and truth of thought which governs both the language and the rhyme, and refuses to be forced by them out of its spontaneous and premeditated course. We seldom are able to find a poem in which the devious and sudden changes of the matter do not betray the tyranny of the last syllables. F. Rawes's poems are unusually free from this great fault. But, as we have said, the literary excellence of the book is not its greatest, which appears to us to be the clear, bold, outspoken devotion of the author to all that is highest and best in Catholic piety. It is unfortunately the lot of Catholics in England to be so exhausted by active undertakings, or by controversial exhibitions of the Faith, that they have little time left for the contemplation of its surpassing beauty. This F. Rawes brings out very vividly in the meditations and poems of this book. The chapters on God, and on the Incarnation, and the poem called "Mary," on the glories of the Mother of God, are full of beauty. But it is not possible for us now to quote them. We can only notice one other feature in the work. F. Rawes, as a son of S. Charles, is one of those who fear that with the peace which the Catholic Church now enjoys in England, will come, as usual, the two dangers which seem to follow peace—that is, worldliness and erroneous doctrine. The Preface is very seasonable, as a vigorous protest against these two dangerous tendencies, which are visibly threatening us.

Great Truths in Little Words : a Series of Tracts. Twelve Visits to Our Blessed Lady. Devotions to the Souls in Purgatory. By the Rev. Father Rawes, of the Congregation of the Oblates of S. Charles. London : Knowles.—These tracts, fourteen of which have as yet appeared, consist, for the most part, of only three or four pages, while the longest—that on Protestantism—has but nineteen. The thirteen others relate, with the exception of three or four having a practical reference to immediate obligatory duty, to what may be called the peculiar Catholic devotions. Every one who loves the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the Immaculate Heart of Mary, and the dear suffering souls in Purgatory, &c., and who knows how inti-

mately connected are the devotions which spring from such love with growth in personal sanctity, must rejoice to see them recommended so forcibly in a compendious and accessible form. The two little books subjoined, are admirably adapted to further the same object.

Meditations on the Passion, and A Packet of Tickets for each day during Lent, in honour of the Heart of Jesus Crucified. By the author of "S. Francis and the Franciscans," &c. London: Richardson. 1864.—Our readers will thank us for calling their attention to this little volume of "Meditations on the Passion," and the accompanying "Packet of Tickets," designed to promote and facilitate a perpetual adoration of our Divine Lord's sufferings during the coming holy season of preparation for the *Easter Festival*.

CANON OAKELEY has published in a separate shape his *Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement* (Longman), which have added so much liveliness and interest to our pages. When we originally introduced these papers to our readers, we expressed our sense of their great value and merit.

The Month (Simpkin and Marshall) continues to maintain the position it has won for itself in first-class periodical literature. Except that comparisons are invidious things, it would be a curious and interesting study to compare Lady G. Fullerton's beautiful story of "Constance Sherwood" with that of Mrs. Ogden Meeker, to which we have drawn attention; the principal personages, as well as many of the subordinate characters, being the same in both. But the reader will not fail to mark the depth of tone, refinement of manner, minute detail, and exquisitely delicate touches that distinguish the one, as contrasted with the animated style, the bold outline, the rich, almost gorgeous colouring, and the nervous, vigorous strokes that characterize the other. Where everything is so good of its kind, it may seem capricious to particularize, but we may single out a short but striking paper by Mrs. Fitzsimon, entitled "Pay for the Ounces." The story is told in the shape of a legend, but it leaves on the mind all the impressions of reality, and conveys, moreover, a very salutary lesson.

Foreign Events of Catholic Interest.

THE FRANCO-ITALIAN CONVENTION.—The treaty of the 15th September, between the Emperor of the French and the King of Sardinia, professes to have for its chief object the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome. This profession is not made in so many words, but appears from the nature and construction of the treaty itself. For the 1st and 3rd articles of the Convention, by which Italy pledges itself not to attack the actual territories of the Holy Father, and not to oppose the organization of a Papal army, together with the protocol which stipulates for the transfer of the capital of the kingdom to some other locality, are merely means towards the great end in view—the betrayal of the Pope and the possession of Rome.

In considering the stipulations of this treaty, the question arises—on what title are the troops of France now in Rome, and what right has Napoleon to withdraw them in such a manner as to leave the capital of the Catholic world in the hands of the Revolution? Let us examine, for a moment, the title of the French occupation, and the legitimate object of the intervention in the States of the Church.

In an allocution held at Gaeta on the 20th of April, in the year 1849, Pope Pius IX., after having invoked the aid of all the powers, claims the special assistance of Austria, as having always shown itself so forward to protect the temporal dominions of the Holy See, and of the French nation, towards which he entertained a paternal regard, because its clergy and its faithful people had sought, with such filial devotion and reverence, to allay the stress of his great calamities. He claimed, too, the succour of Spain, which had manifested so strong a sympathy with him in his trials, and of all the other Catholic nations, so that, united in a sort of filial alliance, they might adopt measures to restore to his throne the common father of the faithful, and the supreme pastor of the Church. After expressing, in the strongest terms, his appreciation of the filial devotion of the King of Naples, as well as of its clergy and people, the Pope concludes by expressing a hope that these Catholic powers will hasten to protect the civil principality of the Holy See, and restore to his subjects peace and tranquillity, by removing the enemies of the Christian religion and of civil society from the city of Rome, and from all the States of the Church. Austria, Spain, and Naples, as well as France, be it observed, were invited by Pius IX. to enter his dominions, which, of course, they otherwise had no right to do, for the express purpose of protecting his temporal sovereignty. The formal exclusion of Sardinia from the number of the Catholic powers whose assistance was invoked to aid in the restoration of the Papal states was significant. The true reason, by the

way, of this exclusion, the *Civiltà Cattolica* shows, from documents since published by Farini, and from others about which he is silent, was the fact, that up to 1849, the Piedmontese Government repudiated the Confederation of the Italian States, because it aimed at the unity of Italy under its own government; and for this purpose it had been plotting against the Pontifical sovereignty at Rome. How this appeal of the Pope to the Catholic powers for assistance against the Revolution was understood, appears from the following note of Prince Schartzenberg, the Foreign Minister of Austria. "The Catholic world," he says, "has the right to claim for the visible Head of the Church the fulness of liberty indispensable for the government of Catholic society, of that ancient monarchy which has subjects in all parts of the universe. The Catholic peoples will not allow the Head of their Church to be deprived of his independence, and to become the subject of a foreign prince. They will not suffer him to be degraded by the hand of faction, which, under the shelter of his sacred name, seeks to uproot and destroy his power; for the Bishop of Rome, who is at the same time the Sovereign Head of the Catholic Church, to be able to exercise his great functions, it is necessary that he be the Sovereign of Rome. Consequently, all the Catholic powers have a common interest in supporting the temporal sovereignty of the Pope. On the other hand, to the countries bordering on the States of the Church, it is of the greatest importance to be on their guard lest these states be made such a nest of lawless anarchy as to endanger the security of the neighbouring governments. It belongs, therefore, without any doubt, to Austria and to France, in their character of Catholic powers of the first order, to raise their voice and to protest against the crimes of which the Pope is a victim."

The interpretation put by France on the invitation of the Pope to the Catholic powers to enter his dominions, and the duty which it conceived to be incumbent upon it, are clearly shown by the message and conduct of the President of the Republic, as well as by the statements of the ministers, and the report of the committee appointed by the Assembly. A few days before he was raised to the Presidency, Prince Louis Napoleon publicly declared to the apostolic nuncio at Paris, that "the maintenance of the temporal sovereignty of the revered Head of the Catholic Church has a necessary connection with the honour of Catholicism, as well as with the liberty and independence of Italy." General Cavaignac, the head of the executive, without consulting the sovereign Assembly, had already despatched troops to Rome. Finally, acting on behalf of the Catholic nations, France delivered Rome and restored Pius IX. The question was then brought before the Assembly, whether the Roman expedition was an honour or a disgrace. Among the papers laid before the Assembly was a letter from the envoy extraordinary at Rome, defining the object of the expedition. It was dated "Head Quarters, Santucci, June 13, 1849." We extract one passage, as follows:—"France has but one end in view in this painful conflict—the liberty of the revered Head of the Church, the liberty of the Roman States, and the peace of the world." M. de Corcelles adds that "the letter of the President of the Republic to General Oudinot, which has been placed by him in the order of the day, has produced a most beneficial effect." In

this message Prince Louis Napoleon declares that the French expedition to Rome has for its object to guarantee to Pope Pius IX. *the integrity of his territory*. M. de Falloux, who was at the time a minister of the Republic, spoke in the name of the French Government as follows :—"We had, then, a great end in view, and we have attained it : a Catholic end, to restore to the Holy See the independence which is a matter of such vital interest to all Catholics, and to use the sword of France to accomplish this great and European design." A committee was appointed by the Assembly to consider the question of the Roman expedition anew, under all its bearings, moral, religious, and political. The committee consisted of men of various views and parties, distinguished by their talents and political position. M. Thiers drew up the report. In this report it was stated that the French interposition was effected "in the triple interest of France, Christendom, and Italian liberty. In a political point of view," it is argued, "an interposition was imperatively called for by the interests of Italy and Italian liberty ; for the Pope would have been restored without us, and that by Austria . . . an Austrian army being on the point of marching on Rome. But war being out of the question, one course, and only one, remained—that France, too, should enter Italy."

The report then deals with the religious considerations involved in the Roman expedition, as constituting the most essential argument in its favour. "The Catholic powers," says M. Thiers, "had assembled at Gaeta to concert measures for the re-establishment of an authority which is necessary to the Christian universe. In truth, without the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff, Catholic unity would be dissolved ; Catholicism would be split up into sects and would perish ; and the moral world, already so rudely shaken, would fall into universal ruin. . . . But Catholic unity, requiring a certain spiritual submission from Christian nations, would be inadmissible, if the Pontiff in whom it is embodied were not perfectly independent ; if upon the territory which ages have assigned to him, and which all nations have respected, another sovereign, whether prince or people, were to rise to dictate laws to him. For the Papacy there can be no other independence but sovereignty. We have here an interest of a paramount nature, which is rightly made to overrule the private interests of nations, just as in a State the public interest overrules what is individual ; and it fully justified the Catholic powers in re-establishing Pius IX. upon the Pontifical throne. Thus," concludes the report, "political, moral, and religious considerations concurred in calling upon France to interfere at Rome." This conclusion was ratified on several occasions, by large majorities, in the Assembly.

In the allocution, then, of the Pope at Gaeta, the right was given to France, as well as to the other Catholic powers, to enter the States of the Church. In the public documents and reports from which we have last quoted, the character and purpose of this intervention are described and defined as "a great and European design," to secure "the independence of the Holy See, and the temporal authority of the Sovereign Pontiff." It had for its object, to restore "liberty to the Roman States ;" to guarantee to Pope Pius IX. the integrity of his territory, and, by guarding "the principle of Catholic unity, to preserve the moral world from falling into universal

ruin." How far the French intervention has preserved its original character, how far the Emperor has fulfilled the promise of the Prince President, it were idle now to inquire. But this much, at least, is evident, that for France, in the face of an enemy, and without the consent of the Pope and the concurrence of the Catholic nations, to withdraw its army from Rome, would be a dishonourable breach of faith towards the Pope, and an open violation of the compact tacitly entered into with the Catholic powers of Europe. By such an act Napoleon, from being an ally, would become a leader of the Revolution; and by attacking, in the Sovereign Pontiff, the principle of moral unity, which the Republic of 1849 supported by its arms, he would endanger the peace of the world, the cause of religion, and, what concerns him more than either, the stability of his own throne.

If we take another interpretation of this treaty, and accept the French minister's explanation that the real object of the Convention is, not to abandon the Pope, but to reconcile the Papacy with Italy, we are bound to see by what measures this understanding is proposed to be brought about. M. Drouyn de Lhuys has fully enlightened the world on this point. In his dispatch of the 12th September, which was laid before Cardinal Antonelli, he pointed out, in calm but decisive language, that the irreconcilable divergence in principle between the two governments was such as must prevent them in future from acting in common. Although the recent policy and conduct of Rome were reviewed and excused in a tone of courtesy, its principles of government were nevertheless emphatically condemned, [as being opposed, both to the ideas of the age and to the maxims of French policy. While for Sardinia there was nothing in the dispatch but words of hope and encouragement, for Rome there was nothing but warning and reproach. The minister, having obtained from Italy such guarantees as he thought sufficient to protect Rome from external attack, had now, he declares, only to aid the Pontifical Government in such measures as were necessary to preserve its internal authority. In thus ostentatiously weighing in the ministerial scales the conduct of Rome and of its unprincipled aggressor, M. Drouyn de Lhuys artfully contrived to conceal the transition of France from one line of policy to another. But what he has not been able to conceal, or rather what he has expressly stated, is that, in the opinion of the French Government, Rome can only be reconciled to Italy by renouncing principles which are not in harmony with those of the age. In other words, the Holy See must adopt the principles and confirm the acts of the Revolutionary Government of Victor Emmanuel, or be exposed, with the consent of France, to a continuance of its infamous and unprincipled aggression. But since Rome cannot, at the bidding of Napoleon, enter on such an evil course, the hope of reconciliation, as suggested by M. Drouyn de Lhuys, with Revolutionary Italy is put out of the question.

Let us turn now to the interpretation which the Government of Sardinia and its Parliament put upon the Convention.

"Of all the guarantees," writes the minister Perruzzi, "that which we have given is the only one which implies no renunciation of principles, and which compromises neither the interests of Italian policy, nor the solution of the Roman question expected for the last four years in vain." "The question of

Rome," says the reporter of the Parliamentary Committee, "since the Convention of the 15th September is no longer a Catholic, but an Italian question. The Convention," he adds, "does not take away a particle of sovereignty, and leaves the general programme intact." By a vote of the Piedmontese Parliament a year or two ago, Rome had been declared the capital of the new Italian kingdom : to gain possession of Rome, therefore, is still a part of the national programme, for this vote has never been rescinded. In reply to the reclamations of M. Drouyn de Lhuys, and his endeavour to restrict the action of the Piedmontese Government, General La Marmora declares that the aspirations of a nation belong to the national conscience, and cannot be made the subject of debate between two governments. And further, in case of the spontaneous outbreak of a revolution in Rome, Italy, he says, will reserve to herself a full liberty of action. In the Convention, Sardinia guarantees not to employ violent or underhand means to gain possession of Rome, but to trust only to moral force and to the progress of civilization. But what is the guarantee of Piedmont worth ? It is not the custom at the Old Bailey to take bail from a thief on his own bond. For twelve years Sardinia has been unscrupulously plotting against every prince in Italy. It is notorious that it has made use of underhand, of corrupt, and of violent means to upset the thrones of its neighbours, and to annex their territories. For this purpose it has not scrupled to employ its highest diplomatic agents to undermine in secret the authority of those very princes to whom they were accredited.

It was the knowledge of such discreditable and disloyal conduct which enabled M. Drouyn de Lhuys to warn the Piedmontese Government, before the face of Europe, not to employ such "underhand means" against Rome. The accusation was as grave as it was public. It was based on evidence produced before the highest tribunal in Rome during the recent political trials. From this evidence it appears that the Turinese Government was at the bottom of all the conspiracies in Italy, and that Cavour took a leading part in directing the movements of the secret and revolutionary societies. Their action, as brought to light in the celebrated trial* at Ancona, was concentrated against the States of the Church. Three central committees were established under the direction of a single head—one at Bologna, which embraced the Romagnas ; another at Ancona, which included the Marches ; and a third at Rome, which had its secret agents throughout the Patrimony of S. Peter, Umbria, and the Maritime States. At the head of this organized plot was placed the Marquis Migliorati, the Sardinian minister at the Court of Rome. It was not a nominal post ; the Sardinian minister traversed the country always accompanied by the most active leaders of the conspiracy. In the various cities through which he passed he received deputations from the Revolutionary committees, spoke without disguise of the unity of Italy and of the aspirations of Piedmont, and won over, wherever he went, new adherents to the secret society. The Sardinian minister was nothing better than an itinerant Revolutionist in the states of the prince to whom he was

* The facts deposed to in this trial are given in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, 15 October :—"I nuovi accordi di Parigi, illustrati da dodici anni di congiure."

accredited. "These models of diplomatic chivalry," says the *Civiltà Cattolica*, speaking of the diplomatic agents of Piedmont, "traversed the boroughs and towns, debauching the people, corrupting officials, instituting committees, trafficking with consciences, and kindling a fierce party-spirit in the minds of men."

Although by the terms of the Convention, and by the ministerial pledges, Sardinia has foresworn the use of violent and underhand means against Rome, yet the habit of conspiracy is so strong within her, and the profits of her dishonour have been so large, that no dependence whatsoever can be placed on the guarantees which she has given to France. But even the Convention itself permits Sardinia to aim at the acquisition of Rome by moral means, and the progress of civilization. What, then, are these moral means, and this progress which, in future, are alone to be directed against the Holy See, but measures just short of actual or open corruption, to be applied incessantly by a power which, owing to former aggression, surrounds the Papal States on every side, for the purpose of stirring up a rebellion in Rome? A revolutionary cordon has been drawn by Piedmont round the States of the Church; revolutionary ideas and moral corruption are poured into Rome day by day. Strangers from all parts of the world pass the frontier and settle in Rome, sworn to work the destruction of the Great City. Bands of revolutionary Italians, Garibaldians, Mazzinians, or Victor Emmanuelites, unknown, it may be, even to the Sardinian Government, are prepared, we may be sure, on the withdrawal of the French, to enter Rome at fitting intervals. The large majority of the well-disposed and peaceable inhabitants at a concerted moment will, it is anticipated, be overthrown, by the avowed and organized satellites of the revolution; the weak and the ambitious, the corrupted or intimidated minority, will openly join in, or passively submit to, the overthrow of the Roman Government, and the institution of a Committee of Public Safety. On the occurrence of such an event, Sardinia has expressly reserved to itself the right of free action.

With such sinister designs as these in view—designs, in spite of the protest of France, openly proclaimed by its Ministers and its Parliament—Sardinia has entered into this convention with the Government of Napoleon.

This treaty is worse than a solemn farce; it is a cynical mockery of public faith and of international obligations. It is dishonest in its vagueness, and seems as if it were made in order to be broken at a convenient moment. But if, after the time agreed upon, Napoleon discovers a reason why the troops of France shall not be withdrawn from Rome, or if, as is most likely the case, there be even now no real intention on his part of handing over Rome to Sardinia, he will notwithstanding be guilty, not only of a disgraceful breach of faith towards Piedmont, but of having, at a critical moment, offered a public insult to the Papacy.

The whole Convention, and all the circumstances attending its introduction, bespeak its origin. Its leading features are double-dealing and trickery. It is evidently the work of one whose whole statesmanship, since he assumed the Government of the French empire, consists in a low expediency which aims at holding his own by setting off one party against another; now abetting the revolution, now favouring Catholicism. It is what the French have called

the system of balancing (*le système de vasculé*), or what we should term, in less disguised language, the playing fast and loose with principles. It is a policy which has called forth not one generous idea, not one act of true statesmanship. It is, moreover, as short-sighted as it is selfish; for by such a hand-to-mouth principle of government, Napoleon will find that he has left not one permanent institution, not one sound principle to serve as the basis of the dynasty he is so intent on founding. The Franco-Italian Convention is the latest illustration of a policy which has all the craft of the lower empire, without even its excuse of weakness.

The Convention considered in its actual results, apart from its prospective effects, which are open to a dubious interpretation, is a formal ratification on the part of France of the revolution in Italy. The spoliation and annexations of Sardinia are confirmed and covered by the signature of France. The Convention abolishes the treaty of Zurich, and sets aside the rights of the Papacy to its provinces, now in the forcible possession of Sardinia. It blots out the Kingdom of Naples, as well as the Romagnas, Umbria, and the Marches. By such an act Napoleon, not only tolerates, but formally concurs in, the guilt of the Piedmontese Government. He tears up, not only his very protest, but all pre-existing rights and treaties, and makes a *tabula rasa* of Italy. This treaty, concluded with Sardinia, behind the back of the Pope, undoes the noblest work of Napoleon's reign. It contradicts his own solemn declaration addressed to the Bishops of France in 1857; for in his celebrated proclamation of the 4th of May of that year, he thus expresses himself:—"We do not go to Italy to foment discord, nor to shake the power of the Holy Father, whom we have replaced on his throne, but in order to withdraw him from that foreign pressure which weighs upon the Peninsula, and to contribute to establish in that country order based on satisfied legitimate interests." It contradicts, moreover, the letter which the Emperor himself wrote to the Pope on the 31st December, 1859, in which he assures his Holiness "that the powers will not disown the incontestable rights of the Holy See to the Legations." Finally, this Convention gives a direct contradiction to the statements made by the Imperial Government to the French Chambers. "The Government," said the Imperial Minister, M. Baroche, "considers the temporal power as an essential condition of the independence of the Holy See. . . . Indeed the question of the temporal power, as the Government has always declared, is not mooted; it cannot even be mooted. . . . As to the temporal power, I repeat that, being a pledge of the independence of the Papacy, it is beyond discussion. *It cannot be destroyed.*"* The policy and the principles of 1859 and 1860 are reversed in 1864. Piedmont triumphs over France. The Convention, indeed, is the greatest bloodless victory which the revolution has achieved in Italy. It rivals in its results the sanguinary battles of Solferino and Magenta. Its moral effect

* The inconsistencies of the Imperial Government, and of Napoleon himself, in regard to this convention, are ably exposed by the Count Anatole Lemercier, who was himself in the Chambers during the period referred to, in a pamphlet which has just appeared, "*La Convention du 15 Septembre.*"

upon Europe is most pernicious ; for it tends to remove from the public wrong-doer the scandal and the shame of his acts. Hitherto Sardinia, whilst enjoying the profits of its spoliation, has not escaped the suspicion with which Europe regarded its bad faith and violence ; but now the legal basis which was utterly wanting to its usurpations is provided by the Franco-Italian Convention. Before the conclusion of this treaty, a return to a state of law and order involved a return to the provisions of the treaty of Zurich. The extensions of the Sub-Alpine kingdom are based on no rights other than those acquired by that treaty. The possession of the Kingdom of Naples and of the other Italian Principalities is a mere usurpation brought about by fraud, bribery, and force. The Franco-Italian Convention is, as far as France is concerned, a condonation of the offences which Sardinia has committed against the public law of Europe. Hence the eagerness which the parties concerned and their abettors display that the Pope should accept this treaty, and confirm such a condonation. The silence, however, of the Holy See, seems to say that before forgiveness there must come repentance and restitution. But in Sardinia there is not a symptom of repentance, not a sign of restitution ; the Convention is but a deep-laid scheme of further aggrandizement, and of a still more sacrilegious spoliation.

In spite, however, of solemn signature and public ratification the Franco-Italian Convention will not, we believe, be so carried out as to leave Rome a prey to the Revolution. Napoleon has no rights over Rome ; the Sovereign Pontiff may, if he chooses, call upon the Catholic nations, as he did in 1849, for protection against the violence of the partisans of Sardinia ; and if the France of the second Empire be less Catholic and less honourable than the France of the second Republic, other nations may offer a more steadfast guardianship to Papal Rome. As long as an Austrian soldier is in Venice it is not likely that France will quit the soil of Italy. Napoleon cannot afford to cede such an influence to Austria. But even if she wished, would France dare, to forsake her post of honour ? Does it lie in the dynastic interests of Napoleon to do so ? Are there not arguments against such a desertion which would powerfully tell on the Emperor's calculations ? Are there not in France 86 bishops (less one nominated by Napoleon, but rejected by Rome) ? Are there not 69,000 priests ? Is there not a revived Catholic devotion to the Papacy, as shown in that noble tribute of veneration, the *Peter pence* ? The Legitimists, if small in number, are powerful by their territorial influence and by the consistency of their character ; the betrayer of the Papacy can expect no mercy, as he deserves none, at their hands. Is not the Orleanist opposition ever on the watch to detect a flaw in Napoleon's armour—to hit a blot on the character of his Government ? Are not Thiers, Guizot, Villemain, Cousin, men formidable in conflict, and in defence of the temporal power of the Pope and of the honour of France ? But it is not bishop nor priest, not Legitimist nor Orleanist, not Catholicism itself, from which Napoleon has so much to fear, as from the national sentiment and the military vanity of France. The soldier, who since his first communion has never once knelt at Mass, would feel his honour wounded to the quick to see the Pope, whom he had so recently guarded, driven by violence out of Rome. The whole army would feel as if it had been defeated by one of those bloodless victories which have

nothing honourable about them. Eager to fight in a glorious cause and condemned by a shifting policy to ground their arms, they would be as likely as not to look upon the Emperor as a deserter from the military glory of France. The nation itself would not brook to be outwitted by Italy; it would not bear to be driven from its post, to be laughed at by sarcastic jesters at home, to lose influence abroad. To have protected the Pope for fifteen years, and to desert him at last without profit or honour, would be anything but gratifying to the self-love of France; it would be an outrage on its sense of honour.* To forsake the Pope, if in harmony with the Bonaparte policy, is in opposition to all the traditions of France. If the Emperor, however, persist in violating this national sentiment, it is not unlikely that the nation might turn round and wreak its vexation and disappointment on its Imperial master. But if the desertion of the Papacy would produce, as we believe it would, anything approaching to such a state of things as we have described, Napoleon is too clever a tactician to endanger, by such an act, his hold upon France. Why should he, indeed? Treaties are cheap just now in Europe, especially since the recent tearing up of that with Denmark. It would be mere mockery to suppose that for Napoleon or for Victor Emmanuel there was anything sacred in a Convention, however solemnly made. He who broke the treaty of Zurich to please the King of Piedmont, might well break the Franco-Italian Convention to please himself; or, he might say, as a salve to his conscience, to save Rome and satisfy his Catholic subjects.

But, whatever else the Italian Convention may do, it will prepare such a burden for the backs of its authors as none shall be able to bear. There is nothing new in this conflict. It is the old war against Christ and His Vicar, which has but one issue—triumph to the Church, defeat to its enemies. More than thirty times, in twelve centuries (as the *Civiltà Cattolica* reminds its readers), has the Pope been removed from the Great City, and more than thirty times has he been brought back again with shouts of Hosannah.

GERMANY.—THE SCHOOL QUESTION IN BADEN.—The same spirit of hostility against the Church, which animates the contrivers of the Franco-Italian Convention and the sacrilegious spoliators of Italy, shows itself, in Catholic Germany, in the attempt to wrest from the Church all control over the school, and to render science independent of faith.

The great struggle which is going on in the world is epitomized in Baden. Here are to be found, on a small scale, the "modern State," and the "free Church;" but here, also, the new era of modern liberties is inaugurated by the Liberal Chambers and the indifferent State forcing upon the Catholic population a system of godless education. The programme of the new era guarantees universal freedom; but its only result in Baden, as in Belgium, is

* The Comte de Falloux has just published a pamphlet on the Convention, which worthily represents the Catholic intellect of France. He speaks on the subject to-day, not so much as a Catholic, as a Frenchman jealous of the honour of his country. The title of the pamphlet is, "*La Convention du 15 Septembre.*" Paris: Douniol. 1864.

a system of centralization and State omnipotence. The modern State gives liberty to the Church, but it is like the liberty of a tree whose roots are cut; for what is the use of such liberty if the doors of the school are shut by the hand of Government in the face of the Church. What fruit can such sapless liberty bear in the land? "Such liberty," observes a German writer, "is like that of a Professor who is allowed to utter his convictions between his own four walls, but not to teach them out of doors." The modern state which grants freedom to Catholicism, aims at making the godless school the Church of the future. Under such a teacher it promises to create a society in which there shall be no angry rivalry in religion, no denominational disputes, but universal peace: it will be a peace, we fear, like that of the grave.

Precisely such an attempt is now being carried on in the Grand Duchy of Baden. In 1860 the Church was declared to be free and independent of the State, yet without enjoying any privilege or honour from the civil power. At the same time the state was proclaimed to be henceforth indifferent to all religions, and to be denuded of all religious character. On such a basis a concordat was concluded with Rome. The next step of the Liberal Ministry was to introduce or support a plan to reform the entire school system of the country. The aim of the proposed reform is, by un-Christianizing the schools, to uproot the Catholic Church, and render of no avail the freedom it has acquired. Against this reform the whole of the clergy, with their courageous and venerable Archbishop at their head, have manfully struggled. In spite of the repeated representations of the Church authorities, the ecclesiastical representative on the Board of Education had been, before even the new project was mooted, neither consulted on school matters affecting the interests of religion, nor called upon to assist in the administration of Catholic school property. This was a direct violation of the agreement between the Government and the Episcopate respecting the management of the schools.

But no sooner was the new bill, introducing an entire change into the system of popular education, laid before the Baden Chambers, than the Archbishop of Freiburg presented to the Government a formal protest against its chief provisions. To this protest the Government returned no answer; and the prayer of the Church authorities, to be allowed to be heard by their representatives before the bill was published, was refused. Against such a violation of the rights of the Church and of Christian parents the clergy adopted at once prompt and active measures. They held conferences all over the country, which resulted in a petition to the Archbishop to convoke the representatives of the "Land Chapter." In compliance with this petition, the representatives of the thirty-five Land Chapters met on the 12th of April, of this year, in Freiburg. After a Mass of the Holy Ghost, the first meeting of the Conference was opened by the Archbishop in a speech which described in vigorous and moving terms the misfortunes which threatened the Church in a most vital point, and which had induced him to seek the advice and support of his clergy. The venerable bishop, although 92 years of age, displayed on this occasion, as he has throughout his long conflicts with the Government, the calmness, the courage, and the strength of purpose befitting a confessor of the Faith. After having suffered and sacrificed so much to obtain peace, he deeply lamented that no sooner was liberty at last granted, than the con-

flict had again to be renewed for the preservation of the faith in the schools of the people. The Archbishop then retired from the assembly in order to allow his clergy to deliberate uninfluenced by his presence. The result of these deliberations was a series of resolutions on the reform of the school system, defining the principles which should regulate the conduct of the Government in the matter of popular education. The resolutions first express a desire that an agreement should be come to between the Church and the State on the matter of education, and propositions to the number of fourteen are laid down as a basis of such an agreement.

These resolutions affirm, firstly, the right of every corporate body, and of every citizen possessed of the requisite intellectual and moral qualifications, to give instruction, and to found and preside over schools. Secondly, that whilst the educational system shall be under the supervision of the State, the religious instruction, and the religious life in the schools, shall be under the charge of the Churches for their respective adherents ; and that the Church, the parish, and the family shall co-operate in the management and inspection of the public denominational schools. That all general ordinances concerning the system of education, especially those affecting religious interests, such as the choice of books and the regulation of studies, shall be issued in agreement with the Church. And that the supervision, examination, inspection, and discipline of the school and of the teachers, shall be exercised by the Church, seeing that it is its duty to impart a religious education, in common with the State. The remaining resolutions affirm, among other things, that without the consent of the Church authorities, the buildings, endowments, and moneys destined for denominational school purposes shall not be converted to the use of schools of another religion, or irreligious or mixed schools. That the district school inspector shall be appointed conjointly by the civil and religious authorities ; and that the rector of the parish shall preside at the local school council, and shall be entrusted with the inspection of the local school. The resolutions further affirm that religious instruction shall be the most important obligatory subject of teaching in the school, and that the teacher in the popular schools shall be bound, on the order of the Church authorities, to assist in the religious instruction ; but that no such teacher shall be appointed or allowed to continue in office without the consent of the priest ; and, further, that the local priest shall be entitled to give religious instruction in the schools of his parish two hours a week in each class. The resolutions conclude by recording a solemn protest against the separation of the school from the Church, and by demanding the co-operation of the Church in the matter of education ; the upholding of the denominational school system ; the retaining of priests as district school visitors, and as inspectors of local schools ; and the maintaining of religious instruction as the most important obligatory element in popular teaching.

The results of the deliberations of the clergy, together with the resolutions concerning the proposed reform of the popular schools, were conveyed to the Minister, accompanied by a letter from the Archbishop, conciliatory in tone, but firm in purpose. The Minister replied to these remonstrances by a furious attack, in the Chambers, on the Church in Baden and its Archbishop. He openly declared that the Catholics had not fulfilled the expectations of

the Government; that they had allowed the Church authorities to consider themselves and the Catholic Church as one. He taxed the Archbishop with being a tool in the hands of a faction, and declared that the Government were daily considering how long they should still tolerate the pretensions of the Ultramontane and clerical party. As if these were not sufficient insults, the leader of the Government of a Catholic people concluded thus:—"We have proclaimed the independence of the Churches on the conditions that they make a free, a reasonable use thereof, but not that they abuse it. If the Church authorities continue in this path, we shall have to consider whether, in the face of such an abuse of freedom, we shall not have to proclaim, so to speak, a state of siege,—not against the country, but against the Church authorities. I utter this openly, in order that it may not be believed that we turn pale in anxious fear of that which has just taken place in Freiburg." This insulting speech of the Minister Lamey was applauded by the Catholic members of the Chambers. Such conduct on their part was a striking proof of the character of the education given in the middle schools, from which religion is already banished. The conscientious Protestants of Baden have joined with the Catholics in indignantly repudiating the conduct of the Minister towards the venerable Archbishop, as well as in opposing his rationalistic attempt to exclude religious education from the popular schools. On the refusal of the Government to consult with the representatives of the clergy on the proposed reform, in which they were so deeply interested, and on finding that all remonstrance was in vain, the Archbishop issued a pastoral letter, instructing the people as to their right of refusing to send their children to schools in which religion was not to be taught. He showed them that it was their duty to forsake the Government schools, and to form schools of their own, where the faith of their children would at least be preserved. Hereupon the Government issued a proclamation directed to the Archbishop, dated the 11th August; to this document the Archbishop replied, and his answer was accompanied by remonstrances from several of the land-chapters. Thus the matter stands at present; the Church is attacked in one of its most sacred rights, and the Archbishop and his clergy can obtain no redress. Their remonstrances are met by contumely and insults from the Liberal Government of Baden.

It is singular to observe how rapidly the indifferent State descends from its neutral heights and assumes an attitude of hostility against the Church. In Baden, as well as in Belgium, and in the sub-Alpine kingdom, the "modern State" aims at substituting for the influence of the "free Church" the influence of the godless school over the minds of the population. For this reason it everywhere seeks, with a restless and persevering energy worthy of a better cause, to take into its own hands the entire management of education. In Baden, as well as throughout almost the whole of Germany, the middle schools are founded on the irreligious principle. The German universities have been so long devoted to the culture of free science as to have gained for themselves the unenviable distinction of being the head-quarters of European Rationalism. And now, under cover of constitutional forms, the professors of rationalism are promoted from the chairs of the University to the Ministerial benches, in order that they may indoctrinate

with their system the countries they are called upon to govern. Hence the general attack which is now being made against the chief educational bulwark which the Church still possesses in the popular schools.

But the venerable Archbishop of Freiburg does not stand alone in the unequal conflict. With the quick and supernatural insight into the schemes of its great adversary which the Holy See possesses, the Pope, in a Brief addressed to the Archbishop, exposes the special dangers of an irreligious tampering with popular education. The Papal Brief begins by pointing out that the deplorable state into which modern society was falling, sprang from the infamous attempts that were being daily made to cast out from public and private life the faith of Christ and the sacred doctrines of religion. It then declares that because the Church was founded to teach all men divine truth, and to train them to a holy life in accordance with divine revelation, therefore the propagators of evil principles were striving their utmost to deprive the ecclesiastical power of its authority over human society. For which reason no effort should be left untried to preserve all the power of the Church, especially in the matter of education.

The Papal Brief, after showing what injuries are entailed on individuals and on society by an education for the higher classes severed from religion and from the influence of the Church, goes on to say:—"Who does not see how much greater evils and losses would spring from this method, if it were introduced into popular schools? For in such schools religious teaching ought to occupy the first place in education, and ought so to predominate as that the knowledge of other matters, which are there taught to the young, should be, as it were, merely supplementary. Unless in such schools the instruction is united by the closest bonds to religious teaching, the greatest danger will arise. All those, therefore, who falsely contend that the Church ought to surrender its salutary control over the popular schools, wish nothing else than that the Church should act contrary to the commands of its Divine Founder, and fail in the grave duty committed to it by Providence, of watching over the salvation of all men." The Papal Brief to the Archbishop concludes by declaring that no pains should be spared to procure a Christian education so necessary for the young, and by warning the faithful that such schools as are adverse to the Catholic Church cannot in conscience be frequented.

The Brief would almost seem to be too wide in its application for a little German principality, were it not that in Baden are contained, as it were, in epitome, all the ingredients of the great European disturbance. Here are to be found Freemasonry, Liberalism, and the "modern liberties," the State separated from the Church, and the godless school. Here, too, is a corrupt and infidel press; and here, also, are to be found liberal Catholics ashamed of the principles of the Church. But here, too, as everywhere else in Europe at the present time, the bishop is devoted to the Holy See, and courageous in the discharge of his duty; and the clergy support their bishop, and find a powerful assistance in their struggle against the attacks of modern liberty in the ranks of the faithful laity.

BAVARIA.—In Bavaria the attack against the Church has somewhat shifted

its ground. The Bavarian Government disputes the right of the bishops to govern their own seminaries, and puts an unwarrantable interpretation of its own on the Bavarian concordat. The Bishop of Spezer has brought this dispute to a practical issue. In his seminary he has recently opened a complete theological school; and against such an exercise of a right secured to him by the express terms of the concordat, the Bavarian Government has raised formal objections. The concordat, concluded on 5th June, 1817, has never come into operation as far as regards the provisions it contains for the education of the clergy.

The fifth article stipulates, "That in each diocese seminaries shall be maintained, and shall be provided with sufficient endowments in estates and funded property (in bonis fundisque stabilibus); but in those dioceses in which they are wanting, they shall be at once founded and endowed in the same manner." After some other provisions, the article provides that "the rectors also and professors of the seminaries shall be nominated by the archbishops and bishops, and as often as it seems to them fit and proper they shall be removed. And inasmuch as it is incumbent on the bishops to watch over the teaching of faith and morals, they shall be in no manner impeded in the exercise of this duty in regard to the public schools."

In spite of this solemn treaty, seminaries for priests, according to the rule of the Council of Trent, as stipulated in the concordat, have never yet been founded in Bavaria. The State has always insisted on nominating the professors of theology in the episcopal seminaries, and on exercising a supervision over ecclesiastical studies; and the Bavarian bishops, with one exception, have hitherto submitted to this infringement of their rights. Several years ago, in spite of the opposition of the Government, the Bishop of Eichstädt founded a seminary in strict conformity with the rules of the Council of Trent; but he had to do it at his own expense, because the State refused the funds for this purpose, which, by the terms of the concordat, it was bound to provide. Later, the money was offered to the bishop on condition that the right of nominating the professors should be conceded to the Government. The Holy See protested against such a demand, and declared that it were better for the seminary to be suppressed altogether than to surrender so essential a right of the Church. The Bavarian Government contended, in answer to the Papal protest, that the right of nominating the professors of theology belonged to the State; because, 1st, The Government at the conclusion of the treaty had had the "intention" of reserving to itself this right of nomination; 2nd, It had always hitherto exercised this right. Such were the only arguments the Government had to advance in justification of its infraction of the treaty. The same conflict is now again renewed in the diocese of Spezer. In April, 1862, the bishop demanded that the fifth article of the concordat should be carried into effect, for in his diocese there were not even professors nominated by the State, and he had to send his seminarists to Munich. Such an arrangement was in many ways objectionable; and not the least grave objection was the prevailing tendency of the Munich school. The bishop waited two years in vain for an answer. He then, on the 24th of May, 1864, notified to the Government that he intended to open his seminary on the 1st of November. The professors were nominated by

himself, but he did not ask for any funds from the State. Again he received no answer. There was a change in the ministry on the death of the late king, and the new minister, Herr von Koch, undertook to provide a theological faculty at the Lyceum of Spezer. The bishop, who knew with whom he had to deal, accepted the proposed arrangement,—on the condition, however, that the nomination of the professors should proceed from himself. This was not what the Bavarian Government wanted. A very animated correspondence ensued between the bishop and the Minister of Public Worship, which ended by the Minister declaring that he would enter on no further discussion with the bishop, but would place the matter in the hands of the police, who knew how to deal with those who contravened his orders. Such a threat on the part of a Minister towards a bishop is eminently characteristic of the insolent audacity of the bureaucratic Government of Bavaria. Conscious of his rights, the bishop, thereupon, wrote to the King—with what effect does not appear. On the 2nd of November the theological lectures commenced; on the same day the Government official of the district informed the bishop that, if the seminary was not closed within the space of two days, he would close it by force, and the police would conduct the seminarists out of the town. The bishop at once telegraphed to the Papal Nuncio at Munich. The Nuncio hastened to the Minister, and in the name of the Holy See protested verbally and in writing against such an act of violence and such an attempt against the rights and liberties of the Church. This step had the desired effect. The Minister von Koch telegraphed to the police at Spezer, to abstain from violence, and to content themselves with a formal protest. The bishop was, at the same time, informed that the Government by no means withdrew their assumed right, and that the pupils in his seminary should never be nominated to any preferment in the royal gift.*

On this dispute no comment is necessary; the overbearing insolence of the minister and his flagrant violation of the rights of the Church are transparent to all. We need only observe that the Minister, von Koch, has recently inaugurated in Bavaria a Masonic lodge, at which he publicly presides. We must say also, in palliation of his offence, that his conduct, disgraceful as it is, is not worse than that which, for a series of years, has habitually characterized the Bavarian Government in its dealings with the bishops, the religious orders, and the Catholic universities. The success with which the Bishop of Spezer has so far resisted acts of injustice to which the Bavarian bishops have too long and too tamely submitted, is an evidence, if one were needed, that the bolder is mostly the wiser policy.

ROME.—In the unholy crusade of might against right, which is being everywhere carried on, next to the arm of force, the instrument most largely employed, is the cheap infidel and immoral press. Against this deadly

* While these sheets are going through the press we learn that the Seminary of Spezer has been closed by the order of the Bavarian Government. Such an act is a violation, not only of the Concordat, but of an inalienable right of the Episcopacy. The Bavarian Bishops are about, we understand, to take decisive steps in defence of the rights of the Church.

weapon Rome has raised its voice, in a letter of the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Index, addressed to all the bishops. By the order of the Holy Father the attention of the bishops is directed to the duty of prohibiting bad books. The letter points out among the many calamities which afflict the Church, the wide diffusion of books calculated to bring religion into contempt, to corrupt youth, and to overthrow social order. It notices that such pernicious books are not, as heretofore, of a scientific and expensive character, but are cheap and popular publications of a nature exactly calculated to destroy the simple faith of half-educated people. The bishops are admonished to proscribe of their own authority all such books in their respective dioceses; and lest their authority should be called in question under plea of defective jurisdiction, the Pope has conceded to them in this matter such rights as appertain to delegates of the Apostolic See.

Such is the last Papal blow against those "modern liberties" which have already wrought so much mischief in political and religious society.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Apologie des Christenthums. Von Franz Hettinger. Freiburg im Breisgau. 1863.

The Simplicity of the Creation. By W. Adolph. (Second enlarged edition.) London: Burns & Lambert; Richardson. 1864.

Lyra Mystica: Hymns and Verses on Sacred Subjects, Ancient and Modern. Edited by the Rev. Orby Shipley, M.A. London: Longman. 1865.

The Nile Basin. By Richard F. Burton, F.R.G.S. London: Tinsley. 1864.

What Men have said about Woman. A Collection of Choice Thoughts and Sentences. Compiled and analytically arranged by H. Southgate. London: Routledge. 1865.

History of a Voyage to the Moon. London: Lockwood. 1864.
